

VOL. XLI, 1

WHOLE No. 161

GENERAL LIBRARY
MAY 4 1920
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN

THE

AMERICAN
JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH

1920

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

CONTENTS.

I.—The Literary Tradition of Gyges and Candaules. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH,	1
II.—Why Were the Jews Banished from Italy in 10 A. D.? By W. A. HEIDEL,	38
III.—A Pun in the <i>Rhetoric</i> of Aristotle. By LANE COOPER,	48
IV.—Tacitus and Tiberius. By G. A. HARRER,	57
V.—Contributions to PALEO Lexicography. Part I. By EUGENE WATSON BURLINGAME,	69
VI.—Paradise Lost 9. 506; Nativity Hymn 133-153. By CHARLES G. OSOON,	76
REVIEWS:	81
<p style="margin: 0;">A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare.—Boethius: the Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy.—Sancti Augustini Vita scripta a Possidio Episcopo.—The Correspondence of Cicero, Vol. IV.—Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. II.</p>	
REPORTS:	89
Hermes LIV (1919), 1 and 2.—Revue de Philologie, Vol. XLII (1918), pts. 3, 4.	
BRIEF MENTION,	92
OBITUARY—Edwin Whitfield Fay, 1865-1920,	96
BOOKS RECEIVED,	97

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XLI.

No. 161.

I.—The Literary Tradition of Gyges and Candaules. By KIRBY FLOWER SMITH,	1
II.—Why Were the Jews Banished from Italy in 19 A. D.? By W. A. HEIDEL,	38
III.—A Pun in the <i>Rhetoric</i> of Aristotle. By LANE COOPER,	48
IV.—Tacitus and Tiberius. By G. A. HARRER,	57
V.—Contributions to Pali Lexicography. Part I. By EUGENE WATSON BURLINGAME,	69
VI.—Paradise Lost 9. 506; Nativity Hymn 133-153. By CHARLES G. OSGOOD,	76
REVIEWS:	81
A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare.—Boethius: the Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy.—Sancti Augustini Vita scripta a Possidio Episcopo.—The Correspondence of Cicero, Vol. IV.—Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. II.	
REPORTS:	89
Hermes LIV (1919), 1 and 2.—Revue de Philologie, Vol. XLII (1918), pts. 3 and 4.	
BRIEF MENTION,	92
MEMORIAL NOTICE: Edwin Whitfield Fay,	96
BOOKS RECEIVED,	97

No. 162.

I.—Unlisted Fragments of Aeschylus. By HERBERT WEIR SMYTH, 101	
II.—Epicurean Determinism in the Aeneid. By TENNEY FRANK, 115	
III.—Notes on the Text of Asklepiodotos. By W. A. OLDFATHER, 127	
IV.—The Latin Text of the Paris Psalter: A Collation and Some Conclusions. By ROBERT L. RAMSAY,	147
V.—The Beginning of the Fourth Gospel. By PAUL HAUPT,	177
VI.—Vocalic Harmony in Fox. By TRUMAN MICHELSON,	181
REVIEWS:	184
Villeneuve's Essai sur Perse.—Price's Suetonii De vita Caesarum liber VIII.—Corpus scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum, more particularly Pascal's Catullus, Annibaldi's Tacitus and Sabbadini's Catalepton Maecenas Priapeum "Quid hoc novi est."—Bloomfield's Life and Series of the Jaina Savior Pārcvanātha.—Jones's Ojibwa Texts edited by Michelson.	
REPORTS:	192
Rivista di Filologia.—Revue de Philologie.	
BRIEF MENTION,	199
BOOKS RECEIVED,	203

No. 163.

I.—Quintilian of Calagurris. By E. G. SIEHLER,	205
II.—Names of Stinging, Gnawing, and Rending Animals, Part I. By FRANCIS A. WOOD,	223
III.—The Lover's Blindness. By M. B. OGLE,	240
IV.—The Trial of Saint Eugenia. By CAMPBELL BONNER,	253
V.—A Note on the Linguistic Affinities of Ardhmagadhī Prākṛit. By TRUMAN MICHELSON,	265
VI.—Tulliana. By TENNEY FRANK,	275
VII.—Aphrodite: Mother Earth. By W. SHEERWOOD FOX,	283
VIII.—Petrarch on Augustus' Letters. By ELLA BOURNE,	287
REPORTS:	288
Rheinisches Museum.—Romania.	
REVIEWS:	297
Haines's The Correspondence of Marcus Aurelius Fronto.—Ker's Martial.—White's Ausonius.—Sandys's Latin Epigraphy. —Loeb's The New Greek Comedy.—Holmes's Handbook of Aboriginal American Antiquities, Part I.—Swanton's A Structural and Lexical Comparison of the Tunica, Chiti- macha, and Atakapa Languages.—Speck's Penobscot Transformer Tales.	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	307
CORRIGENDA,	308

No. 164.

I.—On Overhearing as a Motif of Hindu Fiction. By MAURICE BLOOMFIELD,	309
II.—Names of Stinging, Gnawing, and Rending Animals. Part II. By FRANCIS A. WOOD,	336
III.—The Paraclausithyron as a Literary Theme. By H. V. CANTER,	355
IV.—The Arrow of Acestes. By NORMAN W. DEWITT,	369
V.—Goethe's Quatrain "Liegt dir Gestern klar und offen" a Paraphrase from Maucroix. By LEONARD L. MACKALL,	379
REPORTS:	384
Hermes LIV (1919), 3 and 4.—Philologus LXXV (N. F. xxix), 3 and 4.	
REVIEWS:	394
Smith's Martial, the Epigrammatist, and other essays.—Carco- pino's Virgile et les Origines d'Ostie.—Linforth's Solon the Athenian.	
BRIEF MENTION,	401
MEMORIAL NOTICES:	405
Bernadotte Perrin.—Thomas Dwight Goodell.	
BOOKS RECEIVED,	407
INDEX TO VOLUME XLI,	409

GENERAL LIBRARY
MAY 3-1920
UNIV. OF MICH.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XLI, 1.

WHOLE No. 161

I.—THE LITERARY TRADITION OF GYGES AND CANDAULES.¹

Some years ago I contributed to this Journal (XXIII 261-282; 362-387)² an article in which I undertook to reconstruct the plot of a popular tale of Gyges and the King of Lydia which appears to have been still current in the period of Herodotus and Plato. In the process of my investigation, which I carried as far as the fall of the Eastern Empire, it became more and more evident that the most notable feature of the later tradition of Gyges and Candaules was the increasing preponderance in it of the two versions by Herodotus and Plato respectively. The matter had no bearing upon the subject which I was then discussing, and I therefore mentioned it only in passing. But the fact itself is so characteristic of ancient literary tradition as such, and in some ways is so striking a commentary upon it, that it seems worthy of special consideration.

Let us begin with the later tradition of Plato's story of Gyges and his Ring (Republic 359 D). It will be remembered that in this passage the spokesman, discussing the well-known doctrine that the only thing which prevents even the best of us from doing wrong in the end is the fear of detection, asserts that his point would be proved if both a good and a bad man could be given some power which would render detection impossible. "I

¹ This article was transmitted to the JOURNAL a few hours before the author's death, and so did not have the benefit of his final revision.—Ed.

² My investigation did not concern itself with the ultimate origin, meaning or credibility of the various accounts. For these points the best and most recent authority is Lehmann-Haupt, *PRE s. v. Gyges*.

mean," he says, "such a power . . . as they say was once possessed by the ancestor of the Lydian." Then by way of at once enforcing his point and explaining his reference, he tells the story in question. When he returns to the story at 612 B Plato couples the ring of Gyges with another more ancient and more famous method of going invisible, the Homeric *Ἄϊδος κυνέη* or Hades' "Cap of Darkness."

A brief and interesting story told by a master and in his best style, a story with a moral, above all a story with a literary reference (*Γύγου δακτύλιος*) which could be used to great advantage by writers and speakers—so far as rhetoricians were concerned, here, as the old translator of Bayle says of books of extracts, was "meat already chewed." Nevertheless, we hear nothing of the story until Cicero (*Off.* III 9, 38) translates it in connection with his discussion of the same question of conduct. And strange to say I have been unable to find a single reference in any other Roman author.³

Even on the Greek side I find no mention of this story until Ptolemaeus Chennus (*Myth. Graeci*, p. 192 W) at the end of the first century of our era. Chennus was a sort of purveyor in ordinary to the literary chit-chat so characteristic of that period. As such he can tell us, for example, why the Queen was able to see Gyges in spite of his ring. She had a double pupil, also a dragon-stone. This shows of course that the literary world was on the whole quite well aware of the relation between the story of Plato and the story of Herodotus. Such a book as the *Suasoriae* and *Controversiae* of the Elder Seneca, not to mention a number of others, is enough in itself to show that in practically every instance the source and associations of these semi-popular literary discussions were scholastic. It is fair, therefore, to assume that our passage in Plato had already been familiar to the Rhetorical Schools for a long time. However that may be, we know that it had entered them at least as early as the First Sophistic Renaissance. This we learn from the *Progymnasmata* of Theon, one of the most notable figures in the educational life of that period.

In the second chapter of this text-book (*Rhet. Graeci*, I 159

³ In N. H. XXXIII 8, *Midæ quidem anulum, quo circumacto habentem nemo cerneret, quis non etiam fabulosiorem fateatur?* Pliny was hardly thinking of Plato's story; see A. J. P. XXIII 273.

Walz) for the use of students and teachers, Theon recommends and in some cases discusses those passages from the great classical authors which every schoolboy was expected to learn by heart. These passages were selected and graded according to the age and training of the student, and for the most part fall into three classes: 1. anecdotes (*χρεῖαι*), 2. fables (*μῦθοι*), 3. stories (*διηγήσεις*)—these last being again subdivided into mythical stories and stories of actual fact. Under the first subdivision (*διηγήσεις μυθικαί*) four examples are recommended:

Διηγήσεις δὲ παραδείγματα ἂν εἴη κάλλιστα, τῶν μὲν μυθικῶν ἡ Πλάτωνος ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς πολιτείας περὶ τοῦ δακτυλίου τοῦ Γύγου· καὶ ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, περὶ τῆς γενέσεως τοῦ ἔρωτος· περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν Ἄιδου, ἐν τῷ Φαίδῳ, καὶ τῷ δεκάτῳ τῆς πολιτείας· καὶ παρὰ Θεοπόμπῃ ἐν τῇ ὁγδόῃ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ἡ τοῦ σελίνου.

It will be observed that the very first of these passages is Plato's story. Is it at all surprising to discover that the Ring of Gyges suddenly becomes prominent in the writers of this particular period? We shall also find a practically unbroken tradition of its use as a literary reference until the fall of the Eastern Empire.

In his *Bis Accusatus* 21, Lucian makes Epicurus say, in his plea for pleasure as against the claims of the Stoa, that these apostles of toil and efficiency.

"Cannot bear to be detected in any relaxation, or any departure from their principles: but, poor men, they lead a Tantalus' life of it in consequence, and when they do get a chance of sinning without being found out, they drink down pleasure by the bucketful. Depend on it, if some one would make them a present of Gyges's ring of invisibility, or Hades's cap, they would cut the acquaintance of toil without further ceremony, and elbow their way into the presence of Pleasure."

Again in the *Navigium* 42, Timolaus is made to say

"My wish is that Hermes should appear and present me with certain rings, possessed of certain powers. One should ensure its wearer continual health and strength, invulnerability, insensibility to pain. Another, like that of Gyges, should make me invisible."

Epist. Graec. p. 619, 43 Didot (*Æschines to Xenophon*) we have:

κἀν πολλάκις περικρύπτηται περιθέμενος τὴν Ἄιδου κυνὴν ἢ τὸν Γύγου δακτύλιον καὶ δίκας γράφεται τοῖς ἐν τῇ πόλει· ζῇ γὰρ ἀπὸ βυρσοδεψικῆς.

Libanius, Orat. LVI (Contra Lucianum), 10 says:

ἀλλ' ὥς ἤδεμεν χάριν μᾶλλον ὅψιν ἡδίστην θεώμενοι, Λουκιανὸν ἀσθενῆ καὶ ζητοῦντα τὴν ἀρχήν, οὐκ ἔχοντα, ἃ χρὴν οὐκ αὐτὸν ἐνθυμούμενον, κλέψαι τῇ νυκτὶ τὴν εἴσοδον, ἐπεὶ μὴ πρίασθαί γε ἐξῆν ποθεν τὸν Γύγου δακτύλιον ἢ μισθωσάμενον γοητεῖαν ὑπὸ τοῖς ἐκείνης μαγγανεύμασι δραμεῖν.

Again, Orat. LXIV (Pro Saltat.) 35, he says:

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοις, εἰ μή, νῆ Δία γε, τὴν Ἄιδος κυνὴν, ἣ τὸν Γύγου δακτύλιον ἔχοντες ἀδικοῦσιν, ὅφ' ὧν λανθάνουσιν.

And finally in his Epistles 1031, we have (as quoted by L.-S. Paroem. Graec. II, p. 20):

σὺ δ' οἶον μετὰ τοῦ δακτυλίου τοῦ Γύγου πάντα δρῶν λανθάνειν.

The use of the phrase by Gregory of Nazianzus is glib but evidently quite mechanical; cp. Orat. Contra Julianum (35, p. 628 Migne):

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ὅπως ἑαυτὸν ἀποκρίψει, οὐδ' ἂν πολλὰ στραφῇ καὶ παντοῖος γένηται ταῖς ἐπινοαῖς, οὐδ' εἰ τὴν Ἄιδος κυνὴν, ὃ δὴ λέγεται, περιθέμενος ἢ τῷ δακτυλίῳ Γύγου, καὶ τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης χρησάμενος, ἑαυτὸν ἀποκλέψει, etc.: Orat. 43, 21 (L. and S., Paroem. Graeci, I, p. 21), ὃ πλέον ἐφρονοῦμεν ἢ τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης ὁ Γύγης, εἴπερ μὴ μῦθος ᾔην, ἐξ ἧς Λυδῶν ἐτυράνησεν: Carmina, Lib. I, 2, 30 (37, p. 685 Migne),

κέρδος τοσοῦτον κἂν τρέχειν ὄρους δοκῆς,
κἂν σοι τὰ Γύγου τοῦ πολυχρύσου παρῇ
στρέφης τε πάντα τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης
σιγῶν δυνάστης, etc.

The emphasis which Gregory lays on *σφενδόνη* indicates in itself that this old word used by Plato for the bezel of a ring had long been obsolete or obsolescent.

Doubtless the hereditary reference to Gyges' Ring occurs here and there in the huge Corpus of Greek Fathers edited by Migne—one would expect it for instance to be used by such a firebrand of rhetoric as Joannes Chrysostomus—but I have made no effort to examine this field systematically.

That the phrase continued to live, however, and to be used more or less frequently, is shown among other things by the frequency of its occurrence in the Paroemiographi Graeci, cp. Apostolius 5, 71 (P. G. 2, 353); Macarius, 3, 9 (P. G. 2, 154); Diogenianus, 3, 99 (P. G. 1, 232 and 2, 20); Greg. Cyp. 2, 5 (P. G. 1, 358).

So much for the later literary reference to Gyges' Ring. Among the authors whose interest in the story evidently went beyond the mere phrase which we have been discussing, the most notable is Philostratus. In the *Heroicus*, 2, 137, 29 sqq., he gives a brief rhetorical version of the old story, as follows:

Καὶ μὴν, εἰ μυθολογικὸς ἦν, τὸν τε τοῦ Ὀρέστου νεκρὸν διήειν ἄν, ὃν ἐπτάπηχυν ἐν Νεμέᾳ Λακεδαιμόνιοι εὗρον, καὶ τὸν ἐν τῷ χαλκῷ ἵππῳ τῷ Λυδίῳ ὃς κατωρώρυκτο μὲν ἐν Λυδία πρὸ Γύγου ἔτι, σεισμῳ δὲ τῆς γῆς διασχούσης θαῦμα τοῖς περὶ Λυδίαν ὤφθη ποιμέσιν, οἷς ἅμα ὁ Γύγης ἐθήτευσεν. ἐς γὰρ κοῖλον τὸν ἵππον θυρίδας ἐν ἐκατέρᾳ πλευρᾷ ἔχοντα νεκρὸς ἀπέκειτο μεῖζων ἢ ἀνθρώπου δόξαι.

In his life of Apollonius of Tyana, III 8, describing how the wonderful Indian dragons are hunted, he says:

κοκκοβαφεῖ πέπλῳ χρυσᾷ ἐνείραντες γράμματα τίθενται πρὸ τῆς χειᾶς ἵππον ἐγγοητεύσαντες τοῖς γράμμασιν, ὑφ' οὗ νικάται τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὁ δράκων ἀτρέπτους ὄντας, καὶ πολλὰ τῆς ἀπορρήτου σοφίας ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἄδουσιν, οἷς ἀγεται τε καὶ τὸν αὐχένα ὑπερβαλὼν τῆς χειᾶς ἐπικαθεύδει τοῖς γράμμασι· προσπεσόντες οὖν οἱ Ἰνδοὶ κειμένῳ πελέκεις ἐναράττουσι, καὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀποτεμόντες λήζονται τὰς ἐν αὐτῇ λίθους. ἀποκείσθαι δὲ φασιν ἐν ταῖς τῶν ὀρείων δρακόντων κεφαλαῖς λίθους τὸ μὲν εἶδος ἀνθρώπου καὶ πάντα ἀπανταχούσας χρώματα, τὴν δὲ ἰσχὺν ἀρρήτους κατὰ τὸν δακτύλιον, ὃν γενέσθαι φασὶ τῷ Γύγῃ.⁴

Of the passages remaining to be considered some are merely notes designed to explain the reference to Gyges' Ring, others are rhetorical abstracts, all are directly due to the scholastic tradition.

The story, for instance, is told by Nonnus in his note on Gregory of Nazianzus, *Invect.* 1, 55 (text in Westermann's *Mythographi*, p. 366, XVI) as follows:

Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐν πολιτείᾳς (ἔστι δὲ οὕτως αὐτοῦ λεγομένη πραγματεία) εἰσφέρει τὸν μῦθον τοῦτον, οὕτω λέγων, ὅτι Γύγης ἦν τις ποιμὴν περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν· οὗτος ποιμαίνων ἐν τινὶ ὄρει τὰ πρόβατα περιέτυχε ἀπηλαίῳ τινί, καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐτῷ εὗρεν ἵππον χαλκοῦν καὶ ἔνδον τοῦ χαλκοῦ ἵππου ἀνθρώπον νεκρὸν καὶ δακτύλιον· οὗ δακτυλίου ἡ κεφαλὴ στρεπτή ἦν καὶ ἐστρέφετο. ἔλαβεν οὖν ὁ Γύγης τὸν δακτύλιον καὶ ἐξῆλθε· καὶ ἡνίκα μὲν ἦν ἐν τῇ τάξει ὁ δακτύλιος, ἐωρᾶτο ὑπὸ πάντων, ἡνίκα δὲ τὴν σφενδόνην τοῦ δακτυλίου ἐστρεφεν, ἀφανὴς ἐγένετο πᾶσιν. ὁ οὖν Πλάτων εἰσφέρει τὸν μῦθον τοῦτον, ὅτι ὁ δίκαιος ἀνὴρ, κἂν τοῦ Γύγου λάβῃ δακτύλιον, ἵνα μὴ ὀράται ὑπὸ τινος, οὐδ' οὕτως

⁴ In my article on Gyges, *A. J. P.* XXIII 370, I somehow managed to translate κατὰ τὸν δακτύλιον, "even against the ring," as though it were a genitive instead of an accusative, "according to the ring."

ᾧ φελεν ἀδικεῖν · δεῖ γὰρ τὸ καλὸν δι' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτηδεύειν καὶ μὴ δι' ἄλλους τινάς.

Nonnus practically repeats the same note in his commentary on Gregory, Orat. in Basil. 5.

Poor old Ioannes Tzetzes, at the dawn of the Renaissance—a man who would have been a distinguished scholar if he had had half a chance—was especially interested in our two passages and saw more or less clearly the original relation between them. His *Chiliades* is now so rare a book that I quote here in full the passages in point:

Chiliades I 137-166:

Γύγης τὸ πρότερον ποιμὴν κατὰ τινὰς ὑπάρχων,
Ποιμαίνων εὐρέ που χαλκοῦν ἵππον ἐγκεχωσμένον,
Εἰς ὄνπερ ἵππον ἔνδοθι νεκρὸς τις κεκλιμένος
Στρεπτόν περὶ τὸν δάκτυλον δακτύλιον ἐφόρει.
Τούτον γοῦν τὸν δακτύλιον οὗτος λαβὼν ὁ Γύγης
Καὶ γνοὺς ὡς ἔχει δύναμιν, σφενδόνης στρεφομένης,
Συγκρύπτειν τὸν κατέχοντα καὶ πάλιν ἐμφανίζειν,
Κτείνας Κανδαύλην ἔλαβε Λυδῶν τὴν βασιλείαν.
Ἡρόδοτος τὸν Γύγην δὲ ποιμένα μὲν οὐ λέγει,
Υἱὸν Δασκύλου δὲ φησιν, ὑπασπιστὴν Κανδαύλου ·
Ὅστις Κανδαύλης γυναικὸς ἔρον οἰκείας τρέφων
Γυμνὴν αὐτὴν ὑπέδειξε τῷ Γύγῃ λεληθότως.
Ἡ δὲ καὶ γνοῦσα σιωπᾷ, εἰτα καλεῖ τὸν Γύγην,
Αἶρεσιν λέγουσα λαβὲ Γύγῃ τῶν δύο μίαν,
*Ἡ σὺ Κανδαύλην ἀνελεῖν ἢ φονεῦσθαι τούτῳ.
Γυμνὴ δυσὶν ἀνδράσι γὰρ οὐ στέγω θεαθῆναι.
Οὕτω Κανδαύλην ἀνελὼν εἴλε τὴν βασιλείαν.
Ἐκ τῆς Κανδαύλου γυναικὸς Ἄρδου υἱὸς τῷ Γύγῃ,
*Ἄρδου Σαδνάττης δέ, καὶ τούτου Ἀλνάττης,
Ἐξ Ἀλνάττου Κροῖσος δέ, ὅστις ἡττᾶται Κύρῳ.
Ἄλλ' ἤδη σε σφαδάζοντα καὶ κεχηνότα βλέπω,
Τὴν Γύγου χρίζοντα μαθεῖν πᾶσαν ἀλληγορίαν.
Ποιμὴν ὁ Γύγης λέγεται τῷ στρατηγὸς τυγχάνειν ·
*Ἴππος χαλκοῦς ἀγέρωχός ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία,
Ναὶ μὴν καὶ τὰ ἀνάκτορα · νεκρὸς, γυνὴ Κανδαύλου,
Τῶν ἀνακτόρων ἄπρακτος ἔνδοθεν καθημένη.
*Ἦς τὸν δακτύλιον λαβὼν ὑπασπισταῖς δεικνύει,
Καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς ἀπέκτεινε λαθραῖως τὸν Κανδαύλην.
Στρέψας δὲ τὸν δακτύλιον πάλιν πρὸς τὴν γυναικα
Γίνεται πᾶσιν ἐμφανής, λαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν.

Id. VI 481-484:

Νυσσία οὐσα σύζυγος Μυρτίλου τοῦ Κανδαύλου ·
Τὸ δὲ Κανδαύλης Λυδικῶς τὸν σκυλοπνίκτην λέγει ·

Ἐπεὶ Κανδαύλης ἔδειξε γυμνὴν αὐτὴν τῷ Γύγῃ,
Κτανεῖν τὸν Γύγην ἔπεισεν αὐτῆς τὸν συνευνέτην.

Id. VII 195-202:

Γυμνὴν Κανδαύλης ἔδειξε τῷ Γύγῃ σφὴν γυναῖκα.
Ἦτις καὶ συγκαλέσασα τὸν Γύγην κατιδίαν
Δίδωσι τὸν δακτύλιον αὐτῆς, ὥς ἀποκτείνῃ
Κανδαίλῃν ταύτης σύζυγον, δείξας κρυφῇ συμμάχοις.
Οὐ γεγονότος κτείνας τε λαθραίως τὸν Κανδαύλῃν
Καὶ στρέφας τὸν δακτύλιον πάλιν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα,
Γίνεται πᾶσιν ἐμφανὲς λαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν.
Ἔχεις ἐν πρώτῳ πῖνακι τρίτην τὴν ἱστορίαν.

Last of all, we have the following account in the so-called Violarium of Eudocia (now considered the work of some scholar of the Renaissance), 247:

Γύγην οἱ Ἕλληνες ἐμυθεύοντο τῇ στροφῇ τῆς σφενδόνης, ἣν ἐφόρει, ἀφανίζεσθαι καὶ μὴ ὁρᾶσθαι παρόντα καὶ εἰς ὅψιν ἔρχεσθαι. ὃν καὶ Πλάτων ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐν Πολιτείᾳ εἰσφέρει μυθικῶς οὕτω λέγων, ὅτι Γύγης τις ἦν ποιμὴν περὶ τὴν Λυδίαν. οὗτος ποιμαίνων ἐν τινι ὄρει τὰ πρόβατα περιέτυχε σπηλαίῳ τινί. καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἐν αὐτῷ εὗρεν ἵππον χαλκοῦν, καὶ ἔνδον τοῦ χαλκοῦ ἵππου νεκρὸν ἄνθρωπον φοροῦντα δακτύλιον, οὗ δακτυλίου ἡ κεφαλὴ στρεπτή ἦν καὶ ἐστρέφετο. ἦτις σφενδόνη ἐκαλεῖτο. ἔλαβεν οὖν ὁ Γύγης τὸν δακτύλιον, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν. καὶ ἥνικα μὲν ἦν ἐν τῇ τάξει ὁ δακτύλιος, ἑώρατο ὑπὸ πάντων, ἥνικα δὲ τὴν σφενδόνην τοῦ δακτυλίου ἔστρεφεν, ἀφανὲς ἐγένετο ἐν πᾶσιν. ὁ οὖν Πλάτων εἰσφέρει τὸν μῦθον τοῦτον, ὅτι, φησὶν, ὁ δίκαιος ἀνὴρ, κἂν τοῦ Γύγου λάβῃ τὸν δακτύλιον, ἵνα μὴ ὁρᾶται ὑπὸ τινος, οὐδὲ οὕτως ὀφείλει ἀδικεῖν. δεῖ γὰρ τὸ καλὸν δι' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτηδεύεσθαι, καὶ μὴ δι' ἄλλο τι. ἔχων οὖν ὁ Γύγης τοῦτον τὸν δακτύλιον, ἔλθων ἐπὶ τὰ βασίλεια τῶν Λυδῶν καὶ ἀντιστρέφας τὴν σφενδόνην ἐγένετο ἀφανὲς. καὶ εἰσελθὼν ἀπέκτεινε τὸν βασιλέα καὶ ἔλαβε τὴν βασιλείαν. διὸ καὶ Γύγου δακτύλιος ἐπὶ τῶν πολυμηχάνων καὶ πανούργων λέγεται. ὁ δὲ Ἡρόδοτος ἄλλως ἱστορεῖ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Γύγην, ὅτι ἐπιτροπῇ τῆς δεσποίνης ἀπέκτεινε τὸν Κανδαύλῃν ὁ Γύγης καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν.

It will be seen that this note was written entirely for practical purposes. The author explains the Platonic application and points out the origin and meaning of the familiar proverb. He is not affected by the allegorizing of Tzetzes, but on the other hand he also seems to have been sufficiently modern to have quite lost track of the good old tradition, as we saw it for instance in Chennus and Philostratus, according to which Plato and Herodotus really go back ultimately to a common source.

As we look back over this sometimes thin but always persistent literary tradition of more than a millennium, the most notable

feature of it is the fact that with the possible exception of Cicero's translation, I have been unable to find a single reference which does not go back either directly or indirectly to the school-house. There is something portentous in the length, the strength and the persistence of such a pedagogical tradition. Fancy our "eminent educators" allowing anything, no matter what it was, to remain in the schools for more than thirty generations! It would be hasty, however, to assume that this extraordinary conservatism was entirely due to the fact that no one had the brains or the energy to think of anything new or better. It was a long, long time before the Imperial system of education ceased to be distinctly superior in its own particular way to that of any other nation or period.

Finally, it may be worth observing that apart from the translation of Cicero already mentioned, I find no reference to Gyges' Ring, no sign of familiarity with the story of it, in the entire range of Latin literature. One would have guessed that the paramount authority of a writer like Cicero would have given his version the entrée of the Roman schools. But this does not seem to have been the case.

Let us now investigate and test in the same manner the later tradition of the story told by Herodotus. This, too, begins with Rhetoric. The first, and one of the most important references now surviving, belongs to the Age of Augustus. It is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *De Compositione Verborum*, § 16.

The author's main object and the point which he especially desires to make is (§ 9) that "it is upon arrangement, far more than upon selection, that persuasion, charm, and literary power depend."⁵ "Every utterance," he continues (§§ 11 sqq.), "by which we express our thoughts is either in metre or not in metre. Whichever it be, it can, when aided by beautiful arrangement, attain beauty whether of verse or prose. But speech, if flung out carelessly at random, at the same time spoils the value of the thought. Many poets and prose writers (philosophers and orators) have carefully chosen expressions that are distinctly beautiful and appropriate to the subject matter, but have reaped no benefit from their trouble because they have given them a rude and haphazard sort of arrangement: whereas others have invested their discourse with great beauty by taking humble, unpretending words, and arranging them with charm and dis-

⁵ The translation in this and the following sections is that of Roberts.

tion. It may well be thought that composition is to selection what words are to ideas. For just as a fine thought is of no avail unless it be clothed in beautiful language, so here, too, pure and elegant expression is useless unless it be attired in the right vesture of arrangement.

"But to guard myself against the appearance of making an unsupported assertion, I will try to show by an appeal to facts the reasons which have convinced me that composition is a more important and effective art than mere selection of words. I will first examine a few specimen passages in verse and prose. Among poets let Homer be taken, among prose-writers Herodotus: from these may be formed an adequate notion of the rest. . . .

"There is in Herodotus a certain Lydian king whom he calls Candaules, adding that he was called Myrsilus by the Greeks. Candaules is represented as infatuated with admiration of his wife, and then as insisting on one of his friends seeing the poor woman naked. The friend struggled hard against the constraint put upon him; but failing to shake the king's resolve, he submitted, and viewed her. The incident, as an incident, is not only lacking in dignity and, for the purpose of embellishment, intractable, but is also vulgar and hazardous and more akin to the repulsive than to the beautiful. But it has been related with great dexterity: it has been made something far better to hear told than it was to see done. And, that no one may imagine that it is to the dialect that the charm of the story is due, I will change its distinctive forms into Attic, and without any further meddling with the language will give the conversation as it stands."

Dionysius then rewrites Herodotus I 8-10 (Γύγη, οὐ γάρ σε . . . δὲ μὲν δὴ ὥς οὐκ ἐδύνατο διαφυγεῖν, ἔτοιμος ἦν) in Attic and continues:

"Here again no one can say that the grace of the style is due to the impressiveness and the dignity of the words. These have not been picked and chosen with studious care; they are simply the labels affixed to things by Nature. Indeed, it would perhaps have been out of place to use other and grander words. I take it, in fact, to be always necessary, whenever ideas are expressed in proper and appropriate language, that no word should be more dignified than the nature of the ideas. That there is no stately or grandiose word in the present passage, any one who likes may prove by simply changing the arrangement. There are many similar passages in this author, from which it can be seen that the fascination of his style does not after all lie in the beauty of the words but in their combination."⁶

"The truth seems to be," says Roberts in an interesting passage

For the purposes of our present inquiry this discussion of Dionysius is very instructive. We may almost begin with the assumption that this passage of Herodotus had already been associated with scholastic rhetoric for an indefinite period. Otherwise a man of the type and time of Dionysius would hardly have used it as an illustration in a technical treatise on rhetoric. By the time of Augustus, the examples and illustrations used by the rhetoricians were for the most part veterans in the service. That this was actually the case with this particular passage is suggested for one thing by the fact that it is such an extraordinarily good example of the *λέξις εἰρημένη*. And the well-known passage in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* (3, 9) in which the author discusses and characterizes the two great types of composition, indicates that even then Herodotus had become the classic of that type. If now we add that as Volkmann observes (*Rhetorik*², p. 28), Dionysius as a technical rhetorician harks back to Isocrates, it is at least quite possible that the Herodotean tale of Gyges entered the scholastic tradition of rhetoric at some time between Isocrates and Dionysius.

At any rate—and, after all, that is enough for our present purpose—it actually does appear in a rhetorical treatise of the Augustan Age. There it is used in connection with the claim that composition is more important than selection. This, too, must have been a traditional claim. At all events, it is one which this passage of Herodotus was peculiarly fitted to support, inasmuch as the biblical simplicity of the language used is such a marked contrast to the more or less rare and *recherché* vocabulary which was cultivated, for instance, by an author like Tacitus, and which was characteristic of rhetoric in general during and after the time of Dionysius himself. Indeed, although it is quite certain that Dionysius thoroughly believes in Herodotus, he, nevertheless, takes up the cudgels for him in a way that almost seems apologetic.⁷

(Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *The Three Literary Letters*, p. 11, n. 1), "that, in this instance, the charm lies not so much in the dialect, or indeed in the vaunted *σύνθεσις* itself, as in the attitude of the writer's mind as revealed in the entire narrative, style being interesting (here if anywhere) as the revelation of personality." Roberts has a similar note in his *D. H. on Literary Composition*, pp. 84 sq., where he also bids the reader compare and contrast the narrative of *Livy* 39, 9.

⁷ Of course the Ionic dialect of Herodotus, as Dionysius himself must

This passage of Dionysius besides being of unusual importance in itself is also the only one, so far as I know, in which the Herodotean tale of Candaulus is used to illustrate a question of literary style. It will be observed that the portion of the story selected by Dionysius for discussion is the dialogue, not the narrative. This is entirely characteristic of rhetorical training in the schools. It is, therefore, no surprise to find that later references, in so far as they are scholastic in origin, are so largely confined to this particular portion of our story. But before considering these references, let us take up another important discussion of the story as a whole.

This belongs to the fifth century and is found in the *Progymnasmata* of the sophist Nikolaus. Long before the time of

have felt, undoubtedly does have a charm of its own, especially in a story like this. If we distrusted our own judgment, we might appeal to such ancient critics as Quintilian, 9, 4, 18, and Hermogenes, *De Ideis*, 362, 14 Spengel (cp. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, p. 36). We may grant perhaps that *σύνθεσις* as Dionysius defines it is superior to selection. We may even grant that his experiment on our passage of Herodotus has proved it. Nevertheless the fact still remains that he has failed to prove that the charm of the story is not due to the dialect. The reason—though he himself was apparently quite unaware of the fact—was because neither he nor anyone else could get rid of the Ionic dialect merely “by changing its distinctive forms into Attic, and without any further meddling with the language giving the conversation as it stands.”

In its form, as well as in its associations, the Ionic dialect has the dignity, the harmony, the flexibility of the old Epic. Ionic prose is not primitive in the sense of being inartistic. But it is old. Artistically as well as chronologically it is anterior to Attic prose. The same is true of the *λέξις εἰρομένη*, the type of literary composition—or, as Dionysius would call it, *σύνθεσις*—of which Herodotus has always been the great classical exemplar. ‘*Ἡ μὲν οὖν εἰρομένη λέξις*, says Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3, 9, *ἡ ἀρχαία ἐστίν· Ἡροδότου Θουρίου ἢ δ’ ἱστορίης ἀπόδεξις· ταύτη γὰρ πρότερον μὲν ἅπαντες, νῦν δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ χρῶνται.* “The *λέξις εἰρομένη* is the ancient type . . . formerly it was used by everyone, now by comparatively few.” In short, to state it in a slightly different fashion, Aristotle means that the *λέξις εἰρομένη*—or, as Dionysius might have said, the type of *σύνθεσις* which suggested that term—is eminently characteristic of Ionic prose as opposed to later Attic prose. Anyone who is really acquainted with a modern dialect at first hand, knows that it is characterized by its arrangement of thought quite as much as by its vocabulary. For the whole question of the *λέξις εἰρομένη* as developed by Herodotus for his special purpose, see Jacoby s. v. “Herodotus” in PRE, Suppl. II.

Nikolaus, *προγυμνάσματα* had assumed a very important place in the scheme of education (see above, pp. 2 sq.). Among the most interesting were the practice declamations, more particularly the so-called *ἀνασκευαί* or confutations (Quintilian 2, 4, 18 etc.). These were given the young students and were supposed to be learned by them. The third in the collection of Nikolaus (Rhet. Graeci, I 287 Walz) is entitled:

Ὅτι οὐκ εἰκότα τὰ κατὰ Κανδαύλην

"That the story of Candaules is not credible."

"There was a time when I had a wonderful opinion of historians as compared with poets; for the object of history is truth, the object of poetry is stories. But now it seems to me that Herodotus differs in no respect from the poets; for he obliterates the distinction between the two, and consequently preserves neither the charm of the metre nor the truth of history. One might criticize him for many things, but especially for the story he has told about Candaules. It runs as follows: Candaules, he says, who was a descendant of Hercules and in love with his own wife, exhibited her to Gyges. For he took Gyges with him into his own palace, stationed him behind the bedroom door, and gave him the opportunity of witnessing the Queen from there. She was aware that he saw her and was highly incensed; but she waited until morning, sent for Gyges and gave him the choice of two things—either to slay Candaules, or if he shrank from it, to be slain himself. Gyges chose to survive, Candaules fell, and marriage with his wife was the reward given for his murder."

"This is the story as Herodotus tells it. All the statements in it can be picked to pieces in regular order. 'Candaules is the descendant of Hercules.' What indications of that pedigree are brought forward? The energy and ambition of Hercules were all in the direction of virtue and his deeds saved Greece; but Candaules had an eye only for pleasures. If he were a descendant of Hercules, how could he so belie his ancestry? How again could Candaules be in love with his own wife? For either he did not live with her or else he did live with her and therefore did not desire her; for intercourse destroys love, and the impulse of desire is killed by marriage. How too could he take Gyges into his palace? The palace was full of guards and crowded with people in every direction. Gyges would, therefore, be dragged off to execution before the King got him to the place proposed, and the trick would come to nought before Gyges saw the woman. And where in those rooms was he stationed for the view? Why, behind the door! If so, he would have escaped notice and therefore would not have seen her. For that which

is hidden from people is itself the first to escape notice. How could he see the woman naked? It was not the custom among the Lydians to strip oneself. Not even the men went without some covering, least of all the women. And why should a woman who is merely going to bed take off all her clothes? Women who derive an income from their favours, even if they were to strip themselves before men, would do so for the purpose of inspiring them with passion. Women who are chaste in their intercourse do not bring themselves to strip for the benefit of their husbands. How then could Gyges be present and look at a woman who, even to begin with, had not intended to take off all her clothes? Why did the woman send for Gyges and give him the choice of marriage, if she could not bear his seeing her, and why did she honor as a husband him whom she shrank from having as a spectator at such a time? How could she deliver the kingdom of the Lydians into his hands? Kings are chosen by peoples and by states. I really fail to see then how in the opinion of Herodotus a woman chooses a king and aspires to a fortune which a whole army does not confer. Herodotus ought not to have said these things and such things as these. And when he does say them, all we can do is to disbelieve him."

This *confutatio* is carefully worked out in accordance with the rules given for this type of composition by the sophist Theon (*Rhet. Graeci* I, p. 216 Walz). Some of the arguments touch on themes which had long been familiar to the schools. The reference to the virtue of Hercules, for instance, suggests a discussion which had seldom had an opportunity to rest since the time of Prodicus himself. It has no great value as an argument here, in fact none of the arguments presented here will impress the modern reader as of any great value. Nor indeed did they make any deep impression at that time. Herodotus had long since attained the position of a more or less impeccable classic and therefore no argument against him was taken very seriously. But this had not always been the case. Note, for example, that of all the themes used for *confutationes* by both Theon and Nikolaus, this is the only one taken from history. The rest are all taken from mythology. This in itself would suggest that there was a long tradition of adverse criticism of Herodotus with which the world was fairly familiar. We know that such was actually the case, although little is now left of it except Plutarch's essay *De Herodoti Malignitate*. This essay was written by a great man and one who was evidently more nearly in touch than was Theon with a living tradition of

the subject; but when it comes to the arguments presented, there is little to choose between the two.

Another version of our story as a whole is found in the section given to *διηγήματα* or rhetorical narrations in the *Progymnasmata* attributed to Libanius (vol. VIII, p. 43 F). The text is as follows:

**Ἦρα τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γυναικὸς ὁ Κανδαύλης καὶ παρεκάλει τὸν Γύγην ἐπὶ τὴν θέαν τῆς ὥρας. ὁ δὲ τὸ πρῶτον ἀρνούμενος ἐγκειμένου τοῦ Κανδαύλου συνεχώρησεν. ὑφ' οὗ δὴ καὶ καταστὰς ὀπισθεν τῆς θύρας τὴν γυναῖκα καταγυμνουμένην ἰδὼν ἀπηλλάγη. ἡ δὲ μεταστραφεῖσα τὸ πραχθὲν οὐκ ἠγνόησεν, ἤνεγκε δὲ σιγῇ. μεταπέμπεται δὲ τὸν Γύγην, ἐπειδὴ ἡμέρα ἦν, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν ἀποθνήσκειν ἀντὶ τῆς θέας ἣ τοῦτο δρᾶν τὸν Κανδαύλην ὑπισχνουμένη συνοικήσειν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὸν φόνον. τὸν Γύγην ἤρεσκε μὲν οὐδέτερον, εἰς δὲ τὸ κτείνειν ἀπέκλινε. καὶ διαχρησάμενος καθεύδοντα τὸν δεσπότην γαμῆι τε ἐκείνην καὶ βασιλεύει Λυδῶν.*

The version of the scholiast on *Ælius Aristides*, XLV, 56 (III, p. 411 Dindorf) was, so to speak, a mere matter of business, but it is a good example of the type of rhetorical narratio just quoted:

Κανδαύλης Λυδῶν ἦν βασιλεὺς, παγκάλῃν ἔχων γυναῖκα· νόμου δὲ ὄντος, μὴ τινα τῶν ζῶντων ὁρᾶν τὰς βασιλίδας, ὁ Κανδαύλης ἐνέκειτο βιάζων τὸν Γύγην εἰς θέαν τῆς γυναικός, ὑπηρέτην ὄντα αὐτῷ· ὁ δὲ τὴν μὲν πρώτην ἀπεπήδα, χρόνῳ δὲ ὑπείξας τῷ Κανδαύλῃ βιάζοντι, καὶ εἶδε τὴν αὐτοῦ δέσποιναν. αὕτη οὖν λάθρα τουτονὶ μεταστελαμένη, ἣ θνήσκειν αὐτόν, ἣ κτείνειν τὸν δεσπότην ἔλεγε· καὶ ὅς αἰρεῖται τὸ δεύτερον, καὶ ταύτην γαμήσας βασιλεύει Λυδῶν.

We have next to consider the political verses of *Ioannes Tzetzes*, *Chiliades*, I 137-166 and VII 195-202, the text of which has already been given above.

Finally, and this is almost the last word in ancient literature, *Georgios* (born 1241), later known as *Patriarch Gregorios*, who, it seems, was deeply interested in elementary education, composed a school-book (preserved in *Harleianus* 5735 and other MSS). True to the pedagogical tradition which had prevailed for more than a millennium, it consists of a prose paraphrase of *Æsopic* fables, and some mythological pieces, among the rest the story of *Iphigenia*, of *Æneas*, of *Pandarus* and *Diomedes*, and of *Candaules* and *Gyges*. (See *Krumbacher*, *Gesch. der byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2d. edit., Munich, 1897, p. 477.) The persistence of our story at this late date shows in itself that it had long been familiar to the schools. How familiar it was,

and how persistent the scholastic tradition of it was, is shown by the fact that so far as rhetorical narrations are concerned, it is one of the rare exceptions to the rule of a mythological rather than a historical or quasi-historical subject. In the forty-odd narrations of Libanius, for example, this story and two others are the only exceptions. Even in the confutations and refutations of Theon and his successors, the same rule holds good.

Such is the tradition of the entire story. It was characteristic, persistent and, so far as we can see, entirely scholastic. But this was only one aspect of the tradition. The passage, for example, in Ptolemæus Chennus (p. 192 W), already referred to above, shows that the Herodotean tale of Gyges was quite as much a subject of literary chit-chat in the First Century as was Plato's story of the Ring. It follows, therefore, that it had long been familiar to the Rhetorical Schools.

But the longest and perhaps the most important chapter in the tradition of this passage is concerned with two phrases. Both are found in the dialogue between Gyges and Candaules. The fact also that they are both sententious explains why they, and incidentally the dialogue in which they occur, were referred to so much oftener in the later tradition than anything else in the story. One of the notable features in the growth of rhetoric and rhetorical study under the Empire was the increasing fondness for sententiæ—using that word in the sense of sayings of general application—sometimes proverbial but not necessarily so.* Tacitus, as everyone knows, is famous for them and, as we shall see later, Herodotus was greatly admired for his skill in making them spring naturally from the context.

Turning now to the first of the two phrases which we have to consider, Herodotus makes Candaules say, "Gyges, when I tell thee of my wife's beauty, methinks thou dost not believe me (in fact men's ears are naturally less trustworthy than their eyes). *ὥτα γὰρ τυγχάνει ἀνθρώποισι ἔοντα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν.*" "Seeing is believing," to use the parallel phrase in English. The thought was of course not new. / Indeed, the artistic value and fitness of it in this particular connection are due to the fact not

* Ernesti, *Lex. Techn.* s. v.; Seneca, *Controv. I, Praef.*; Quint. *IV 2, 121*; Theon, *I, p. 200 W.*

only that it was not new but that it was a commonplace familiar to everyone.

So far as Greece is concerned, however, the only notable occurrence of the thought, before Herodotus, seems to be in a fragment of Heraclitus quoted by Polybius 12, 27, 1.⁹ The passage reads:

δυνεῖν γὰρ ὄντων κατὰ φύσιν ὥσανεῖ τινων ὀργάνων ἡμῖν, οἷς πάντα πυθανόμεθα καὶ πολυπραγμονοῦμεν, ἀκοῆς καὶ ὁράσεως, ἀληθινωτέρας δ' οὔσης οὐ μικρῇ τῆς ὁράσεως κατὰ τὸν Ἡράκλειτον· ὀφθαλμοὶ γὰρ τῶν ὄντων ἀκριβέστεροι μάρτυρες· Ἡράκλειτον here was changed to Ἡρόδοτον by Leutsch, etc., but Ἡράκλειτον is the reading of the MSS, and there is no good reason for doubting it.

Sophocles, *Ced.* Tyr. 1237,

αὐτὴ πρὸς αὐτῆς. τῶν δὲ πραχθέντων τὰ μὲν
ἀλγιστ' ἀπειστὶν· ἡ γὰρ ὄψις οὐ πάρα,

though sometimes quoted in this connection, is hardly parallel.

Latin cognates are fairly numerous,¹⁰ but the only passage which one might suspect of being an echo of the Herodotean phrase is Horace, *Ars Poetica*, 180:

Segnius irritant animos demissa per aurem
Quam quae sunt oculis subiecta fidelibus, et quae
Ipse sibi tradit spectator.

On the Greek side, it is again Dionysius of Halicarnassus—if indeed Dionysius is the author of the following passage—who furnishes the first reference, *Rhetoric*, 11, p. 401:¹¹

Furthermore, figures of speech also indicate the distinctive quality of the barbarian mind, as was undoubtedly the case when Herodotus makes Candaules say to Gyges in the course of his

⁹ Frag. XV Bywater; frag. 101a Diels. See Diels' note and especially R. von Scala, *Studien des Polybios*, Stuttgart, 1890, I, pp. 88 ff.

¹⁰ Plautus, *Asin.* 202: *Semper oculatae manus sunt nostrae, credunt quod vident*; Plautus, *Truc.* 490 (also quoted by Apuleius, *Flor.* 2 and Festus, 179 M): *Pluris est oculatus testis unus quam auriti decem*; Terence, *Eun.* 350: *Vidi, novi*; Seneca, *N. Q.*, 4, 3, 1: *Itaque ex his me testibus numero secundae notae, qui audivisse quidem se, vidisse negant*, etc.; Seneca, *Epist.* 6, 5: *Homines amplius oculis quam auribus credunt*; Hieronymus, *Epist.* 64, 10: *Multoque plus intellegitur quod oculis videtur quam quod aure percipitur*. Cicero, *De Orat.* 3, 161, though quoted in this connection, is not in point.

¹¹ I doubt whether Strabo 2, 5, p. 117 is in any sense an echo of Herodotus.

conversation with him: "In fact, men's ears are naturally less trustworthy than their eyes." For he did not speak of 'hearing' and 'sight,' but transferred the thought to the parts of the body concerned.

It is quite true that a large use of figurative speech, especially in ordinary conversation, is more or less characteristic of the barbarian mind. But the long tradition of this particular use in Greek itself, beginning as we have seen as early at least as Heraclitus, suggests that Dionysius might have done better to select some other example. This, however, is a point with which we are not directly concerned.

Chronologically the first to consider after Dionysius is Philo Judaeus. He displays an extraordinary fondness for this thought, but, after a careful examination of his entire works, I can give no example which seems to be suggested by our phrase.

We now come to Lucian—in the discussion of a question like this always an author of unusual interest. Perhaps no late writer had a wider range of reading, certainly no one could make a more felicitous use, if he chose, of literary tradition. In this period of the first Sophistic Renaissance special attention, as we have already seen, was given to Herodotus. The passage from Nikolaus discussed above indicates that Herodotus in general and his stories of Cræsus and of Candaules in particular were firmly rooted in the schools. We gather from Lucian how familiar they must have been to the reading public—all of whom had been educated in those schools. An excellent example of Lucian's methods of dealing with Herodotean material is found in his *De Domo*, 19 ff. His description of the handsome building naturally brings up the question of the superiority of seeing to hearing. Lucian defends the former against an assumed opponent whom he calls *ὁ λόγος*. In the passage with which we are concerned Lucian says:

"Compare the story of the Sirens with that of the Gorgons, if you would know how insignificant is the power of words in comparison with that of visible objects. The enchantments of the former were at the best a matter of time; they did but flatter the ear with pleasing songs; if the mariner landed, he remained long on their hands, and it has even happened to them to be disregarded altogether. But the beauty of the Gorgons, irresistible in might, won its way to the inmost soul, and wrought amazement and dumbness in the beholder; admiration

(so the legend goes) turned him to stone. All that my opponent has just said about the peacock illustrates my point: that bird charms not the ear, but the eye. Take a swan, take a nightingale, and set her singing: now put a silent peacock at her side, and I will tell you which bird has the attention of the company. The songstress may go hang now; so invincible a thing is the pleasure of the eyes. Shall I call evidence? A sage, then, shall be my witness, how far mightier are the things of the eye than those of the ear. Usher, call me Herodotus, son of Lyxes, of Halicarnassus.—Ah, since he has been so obliging as to hear the summons, let him step into the box. You will excuse the Ionic dialect; it is his way.

“Gentlemen of the Jury, the Theory hath spoken sooth. Give good heed to that he saith, how sight is a better thing than hearing; for a man shall sooner trust his eyes than his ears.”

“You hear him, Gentlemen? He gives the preference to sight, and rightly. For words have wings; they are no sooner out of the mouth than they take flight and are lost; but the delight of the eyes is ever present, ever draws the beholder to itself. Judge, then, the difficulty the orator must experience in contending with such a rival as this Hall, whose beauty attracts every eye.” [Fowler’s trans.]

Again in his *De Saltatione*, 78, an essay in which it is several times suggested that pantomime appeals both to the ear and the eye, Lucian says:

“The eyes, according to Herodotus, are more credible witnesses than the ears; though the pantomime, by the way, appeals to both kinds of evidence.”

Finally, in his amusing essay on *The Way to Write History*, 29, he says:

“Another entertaining person, who has never set foot outside of Corinth, nor travelled as far as its harbour—not to mention seeing Syria or Armenia—starts with words which impressed themselves on my memory: ‘Seeing is believing’: *Ὅρα ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπιστότερα*. I therefore write what I have seen, not what I have heard.”

It will be noticed that no author is mentioned here, but we may be quite sure that both Lucian and the majority of his readers thought of Herodotus.

The next example on my list belongs to the second Sophistic Renaissance. In a letter to Leontius (XXI, *Epistolog. Graeci*, p. 345, 45, Didot) the Emperor Julian begins an attack on his correspondent with

"The historian from Thurii says that 'men's ears are less trustworthy than their eyes.' So far as you are concerned, I hold the opposite opinion."

Again, in one of his speeches (4, 145 D) he says:

"Since the eyes are more trustworthy than the hearing though they are less trustworthy and weaker than the understanding, come let us endeavor," etc.

An unexpected and interesting application of our phrase is made by Libanius, Declam. 30, 53 (VI, p. 647 F). The envious man complains that his neighbor's handsome house is more than he can bear to look upon:

ἀμυδρὰν ἔχει τὰ ὄψα τὴν λύπην, διὰ δὲ τῶν ὀμμάτων ὀξείᾳ τις ὀδύνη κάτειναι εἰς τὴν καρδίαν. ὁρᾶν δὲ καὶ μὴ βουλόμενον ἀνάγκη.¹³

Two generations later the ecclesiastic Theodoretus (Graec. Aff. Cur. 10, 103), discussing prophecy and emphasizing the fact that as a basis of belief seeing surpasses hearing, closes with the remark:

"And Herodotus cleverly tells us that men's ears are less trustworthy than their eyes. For the eyes of course see what the ears hear."

A scholiast on Aratus says in his Introduction [p. 89, Maass]:

Καλὸν κατὰ τὸν Κυρηναῖον [Callimachus, Epig. 27] ἀμείψασθαι τῷ λόγῳ τὸν Ἀράτου πόνον, ὃν ἐπόνησεν

ἤμενος (οὐδέ οἱ ὕπνος ἐπὶ βλεφάροισιν ἔπιπτεν·

Πλημάδας εἰσορόωντι καὶ ὁψὲ δίοοντα Βοώτην

Ἄρκτον θ', ἣν καὶ Ἄμαξαν ἐπὶ κλησὶν καλέουσιν)

ὑπὲρ τὸν Ἰθακήσιον κυβερνήτην (Odys. 5, 271-3)· τῷ μὲν γὰρ Ἀλικαρνασσεῖ (Herod. 1, 8) ὄψα ἀπιστότερα ὀφθαλμῶν τυγχάνει, Ἄρατος δὲ τὴν μάθησιν ἅμα τοῖς ὤσιν ἐπιδείκνυσι τοῖς ὄμμασιν.

The Scholia Veneta (Homer, Il. T, 292) give the thought; but no necessary suggestion of an echo of Herodotus is to be detected either here or in the following passage from Theophylactus Simocatta, Dial. 10, 1 [vol. I, p. 177 Ideler]:

¹³ We cannot say that there is an echo of Herodotus in the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions, III 44, where in a supposed argument between Peter and Simon Magus we have: Which of the two can better persuade an incredulous man, seeing or hearing? Then Simon said: "Seeing."

ταῖς φιλοπευθέσι ψυχαῖς κόρος οὐκ ἔστι γνώσεως. οὐκοῦν ἐπὶ τὴν νύσσαν ὁ λόγος, Ἀντίσθενες. ὧτα γάρ μοι ὀφθαλμῶν ἀπληστότερα.

Finally, Apostolius XVIII, 71, Par. Graeci, II, p. 744, sets down ὥτιων πιστότεροι ὀφθαλμοί in his collection of proverbs and offers the following grammatical explanation in his note:

ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλόγως τὰ μείω τοῖς κρείττοσι παραβαλλομένων. ἰστέον δ' ἂν σοι εἴη, ὥς τὸ ἀκούω οὐ μόνον γενικῇ ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰτιατικῇ συντάσσεται, ὥς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα κατηγορήματα τῶν αἰσθήσεων πλὴν τῆς ὁράσεως· ἐκείνη γὰρ μόνη αἰτιατικῇ ἄτε βασιλικωτέρα τῶν ἄλλων οὔσα καὶ ἐφ' ἐνὸς ἰδρύνεσθαι μόνον προσήκουσα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄνω καὶ κάτω φέρεσθαι.¹³

The phrases collected by the Paroemiographi are not always proverbs in the strict sense of the word. On the contrary, the collection is more often a cross between Bartlett's 'Familiar Quotations' and Fumagalli's 'Chi l'ha detto?' The phrase, however, not only sounds like a genuine proverb but differs from Herodotus in the arrangement of the thought. ὥτιων πιστότεροι ὀφθαλμοί would be the natural statement of the idea in Greek. Herodotus states it as 'ears less trustworthy than eyes' because the reversal, so to speak, is more in harmony with his context.

The history of this phrase, as will be seen from the survey just given, has a certain interest and significance of its own. When Herodotus used it, it had long been a commonplace, almost a proverb. Indeed, it was for that very reason that he did use it. But as early at least as the second century of our era it was so thoroughly identified with the Herodotean account of Candaules that it had assumed the character of a definite literary allusion. The principal, if not the only, reason for it was the fact that this particular passage was carefully studied in the Rhetorical Schools.

To the same cause may be traced the long vitality of another phrase in our story. This is the statement of Gyges in his reply to Candaules that "woman, in putting off her raiment, also putteth off her respect": ἅμα δὲ κιθῶνι ἐκδυομένῳ συνεκδύεται καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ γυνή. Like its predecessor just discussed and for the same reason, this also should be a commonplace. That this actu-

¹³ Cf. Ap. Dysc. περὶ συντάξεως 290, 10 sqq. (Bekker) and B. L. Gildersleeve, A Syntactician among the Psychologists, Journ. Philos. Psychol. and Scientific Methods, II 93.—C. W. E. M.

ally was the case is shown by the famous saying which Diogenes Laertius attributes to Theano the wife of Pythagoras (8, 1, 43):

"She advised the woman intending to go to her own husband to put off her modesty together with her garments, and when she arose to put it on again with them": τῇ πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα μελλούσῃ πορεύεσθαι παρῆναι ἅμα τοῖς ἐνδύμασι καὶ τὴν αἰσχύνην ἀποτίθεσθαι, ἀνισταμένην τε πάλιν ἅμα αὐτοῖσιν ἀναλαμβάνειν.

This in itself presupposes the existence even in Theano's time of the commonplace which long afterwards Herodotus put in the mouth of Gyges.

The same commonplace seems to have suggested the same discussion and the same conclusion to Plutarch. In the *Coniug. Praecepta*, 10, 139 C, he observes that

"Herodotus is not correct in saying that a woman lays off her modesty together with her raiment. On the contrary, the chaste woman puts on modesty instead," etc.

Here, as with the phrase previously discussed, the attribution to Herodotus of what, in substance at least, was an ancient commonplace indicates how firmly his tale of Gyges was fixed in the literary tradition. Cp., also, Plutarch, *De audiendo*, 1.

We have already seen that the story was studied in the Rhetorical Schools of the second century. In this connection it is interesting to observe that while discussing the use of *sententiae*, which he says should spring naturally from the context, Theon (I, p. 200 Walz) quotes two from Herodotus—one from the story of Croesus, the other, our phrase, from the story of Gyges. Such being the case, the phrase must have been doubly and trebly familiar in later times. And that this was the case is also suggested by the fact that it occurs no less than twice in the *Florilegium* of Stobaeus—32, 8, and again, more correctly, in 74, 36.

In his *Pædagogus* II, 10, 100 (I, p. 299 Dindorf), Clemens Alexandrinus says:

δεῖ δὲ καθαρῶ καθαρῶ θέμις θιγγάνειν· μὴ δὲ ἅμα χιτῶνι ἀποδυμένῳ ἀποδυσώμεθα καὶ τὴν αἰδῶ ποτε, ἐπεὶ οὐδέποτε τῷ δικαίῳ σωφροσύνην ἀποδύσασθαι θέμις.

The Scholiast (p. 444) on this passage quotes the Herodotean phrase.

Clement was one of the best educated as well as one of the most gifted of the Church Fathers. The same cannot be said of Theodoretus, whose reference to the phrase regarding eyes and ears has already been noted. In his *Graec. Affect. Curatio* 9, 42, he quotes the following passage from Plato (*Leg.* XI 925 A) :

τὴν δὲ τοῦ τῶν γάμων χρόνου συμμετρίαν τε καὶ ἀμετρίαν ὁ δικαστὴς σκοπῶν κρινέτω, γυμνοὺς μὲν τοὺς ἄρρενας, γυμνὰς δὲ ὀμφαλοῦ μέχρι θεώμενος τὰς θηλείας.

After which the worthy ecclesiastic allows himself to remark impressively that

"The one who made these laws did not remember the words of the wife of Candaules. For when her husband bade her show her naked body to him, she said very chastely that a woman in putting off her raiment at the same time put off her modesty."

Theodoretus gets many of his quotations from the classics indirectly through Eusebius and others. This, however, is one which his latest editor counts among those secured at first hand. If so, Theodoretus must have had a very poor memory. I, myself, should be inclined to believe that he had a fair memory of the phrase, because he had learned it in school, but only a vague recollection of the story in which it was found.

This completes the ancient history of our phrase, so far as I have been able to trace it. As regards the sentiment expressed, it is to be observed that Dionysius does not consider it as specifically barbarian—in spite of the fact that Herodotus himself further down felt called upon to explain the resentment of the Queen by stating that "among the Lydians, and nearly all the other barbarians, even for a man to be seen naked is reckoned a deep disgrace."

As a matter of fact, the standard of modesty is much more a matter of convention than is generally supposed. It varies more or less according to race, period, etc. Nothing is better known to the modern world than the attitude of the Greeks on this subject, as set forth in the statement of Herodotus just quoted; cf. also Plato, *Resp.* 452 C, and Philostratus, *Imagines* I, 30. But the attitude of the nation, even if truthfully stated, is not necessarily the attitude of the individual. One Lysidice, as described by Dio the philosopher (*Clem. Alex. Strom.* 4, 19,

120), would have been unusual even in the severest years of the Victorian Age:

Ναὶ μὴν Δίῳ ὁ φιλόσοφος Λυσιδίκην τινὰ γυναῖκα ἱστορεῖ δι' ὑπερβολὴν αἰδοῦς αὐτῇ χιτῶνι λοῦεσθαι, Φιλωτέραν δέ, ὅποτε μέλλοι εἰσιέναι τὴν πύελον, ἡσυχῇ ἐπαναστέλλεσθαι τὸν χιτῶνα καθ' ὅσον τὰ γυμνὰ τὸ ὕδωρ ἔσκεπεν, εἶτα κατ' ὀλίγον αὐθις ἀνιοῦσαν ἐπεινδύσασθαι.

And we may be sure that there never was a time in any country when a woman of character would not have resented bitterly the treatment which Candaules accorded his queen.

One more phrase remains to be considered before proceeding to other matters. This is *χρῆν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς*. It is not a sententia. The remarkable vitality of it is rather due to the fact that it is so eminently characteristic of Greek in general and of Herodotus in particular. It is a homely expression of that idea of Nemesis, or balance, which was so firmly fixed in the antique mind and so characteristic of antique thought. The Tragedy could hardly have existed without it, and, as for Herodotus, his entire book is one long lesson in it. The story of Candaules and the story of Croesus are conspicuous examples of it, but there are others; and in fact Herodotus makes the same comment no less than four times elsewhere (2, 161; 4, 79; 5, 92 d; 9, 109). Nevertheless, and here again scholastic rhetoric was undoubtedly the carrier, this phrase was not only felt to be distinctively Herodotean, but it was regularly associated with his story of Candaules. That this was the case is shown by Lucian in his *Asinus* 28. Relating the story of his adventures and mishaps in the form of an ass, the hero says at this point:

"But when we went to the field, the herdsman mingled me with the horses and led us to the herd for pasture. And really after that it was written that I should fare as did Candaules; for the overseer of the horses left me behind in the hands of his wife Megapole, and she harnessed me to the mill," etc.

The sentence in question is: *ἐχρῆν δὲ ἄρα κἀνταῦθα ὥσπερ Κανδαύλῃ κάμοι γενέσθαι*. What is the solution of the puzzle? The old scholar Wesselingius said, supply *κακῶς*. This of course is correct. That it should be so shows in itself how familiar the Herodotean version was to the contemporary reading public.

Again, in his essay on *The Way to Write History*, Lucian says (18):

"Again, it would be a sinful neglect to omit the man who begins like this: 'I devise to tell of Romans and Persians'; then a little later, 'For 'twas Heaven's decree that the Persians should suffer evils'; ἔδεε γὰρ Πέρσῃσι γενέσθαι κακῶς; and again, 'One Osroes there was, whom Hellenes name Oxyroes'—and much more in that style. He corresponds, you see, to one of my previous examples; only he is a second Herodotus, and the other a second Thucydides."

An epigram of Agathias (A. P. VII 567):

Κανδαύλου τόδε σῆμα · Δίκη δ' ἐμὸν οἶτον ἰδοῦσα
οὐδὲν ἀλιτράινειν τὴν παράκοιτιν ἔφη.
ἤθελε γὰρ δισσοῖσιν ὑπ' ἀνδράσι μὴδὲ φανῆναι,
ἀλλ' ἢ τὸν πρὶν ἔχειν, ἢ τὸν ἐπιστάμενον.
χρῆν ἄρα Κανδαύλην παθεῖν κακόν · οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔτλη
δεῖξαι τὴν ἰδίην ὄμμασιν ἄλλοτρίοις.

shows that the phrase was equally familiar to the public three hundred years later.

Finally, two examples are quoted from Procopius—one from the Bell. Pers. I 25, 26:

Ἰωάννης δὲ (χρῆν γὰρ αὐτῷ γενέσθαι κακῶς) τὴν βασιλέως ὑποθήκην
ἐν ἀλογίᾳ πεποιημένος,

the other from Bell. Goth. I 4, 4:

Ἀμαλασοῦνθα δὲ (χρῆν γὰρ οἱ γενέσθαι κακῶς) ἐν οὐδενὶ λόγῳ φύσιν
τὴν Θεωδάτου ποιησαμένη.

It will be observed that in neither case does he appear to be conscious of making a quotation at all. But in view of what has been said above, we may be tolerably certain that he knew the phrase to be Herodotean.

But the tradition of this story is by no means confined to phrases alone. On the contrary, its use for other purposes is quite as noticeable. A case in point is the very idea of Nemesis illustrated by the phrase just discussed. In the Tragedy it generally appears in the form of Ate, or divine vengeance. In everyday life it appears as the ups and downs of fickle fortune, a subject of which the world at large never grew weary. The guests, for example, at Trimalchio's dinner table, most of whom are freedmen, discuss it as freely and eagerly as in the same situation we would wax enthusiastic over politics or our favorite dishes. Above all in the Rhetorical Schools, the presentation of this subject in various forms continued until the very end of

antiquity itself. The Tenth Satire of Juvenal, the Sixty-fourth Oration (De Fortuna) in the corpus of Dio Chrysostomus—and many others might be mentioned—are devoted entirely to this subject. Socrates, Cicero, Demosthenes, Priam, Alexander, Xerxes, Seianus, Pompey, Marius, Hannibal, Sardanapallus, Caesar, Mithridates—history and mythology were ransacked for striking examples, and most of them became commonplaces in the Rhetorical Schools. Few were so familiar and so notable as Xerxes, Croesus, and Candaules—all three furnished by Herodotus. We have seen how Candaules was treated by Herodotus. With him the story of Gyges becomes a great tragedy of destiny. In Justinus, Candaules has already become a mere illustration of the theme so long familiar to the Rhetorical Schools. "Fuere Lydis," says Justinus at the very beginning of his account, "multi ante Croesum reges variis casibus memorabiles, nullus tamen fortunae Candauli comparandus" (I 7, 14).

Another characteristic method of dealing with this theme is furnished by [Dio Chrysostomus] De Fortuna, LXIV 27:

θησανροὶ μὲν εἰς ἀνθρώπους οὗτοι παρὰ θεοῖς· ταμεύει δὲ αὐτῶν πρὸς τὸ ἐπιβάλλον ἡ τύχη καὶ ῥήτορι καὶ στρατηγῷ καὶ πένητι καὶ πλουσίῳ καὶ πρεσβύτῃ καὶ νέῳ. Κροίσῳ δίδωσι χρυσόν, Κανδαύλῃ γυναῖκα, Πηλεῖ ξίφος, Νέστορι ἄσπιδα, Πτερέλῃ κόμην χρυσήν, Νίσῳ πλόκαμον πορφυροῦν, Ἀλκιβιάδῃ κάλλος, Σωκράτει φρόνησιν, Ἀριστείδῃ δικαιοσύνην, Λακεδαιμονίοις γῆν, Ἀθηναίοις θάλατταν. εἶτα ἐν μέρει τούτων μὲν ἀφείλετο, ἄλλοις δὲ ἔδωκεν. καὶ οὐδέν μοι δοκεῖ ὁ βίος τῶν ἀνθρώπων πομπῆς διαφέρειν ἐν ταῖς ἡμερησίαις μεταβολαῖς.

In Justinus as well as in Herodotus, the visible instrument of Destiny is the woman. She is the evil genius of the doomed king. Viewed from this angle, Candaules was called upon to illustrate another theme, which not only in the Rhetorical Schools but in the world at large has been familiar ever since the temptation of Eve. This is the assertion that the greatest enemy of mankind is womankind. As the old English etymologer has it, "woman is woe-man." The most striking example of this for our purpose is furnished by Achilles Tatius I 8. In this passage Clinias, hearing that his friend is about to be married, attempts to dissuade him from it by citing a number of dreadful examples, among the rest,

"Eriphyle's necklace, Philomela's dinner, Sthenoboea's lie,

Aërope's theft, Procne's murder. Agamemnon desired the beauty of Chryseis, Achilles that of Briseis—the one lover brought a plague upon the Greeks, the other mourning upon himself. Candaules married a beautiful wife; but by her he was slain."

The nature and peculiarities of love and lovers were much discussed in antiquity, especially by the philosophers and afterwards in the Rhetorical Schools. Most of us, for example, have met the man who insists on telling us all about his love-affair. The same man was quite as common in antiquity, and the standard example of him appears to have been Candaules.

Why does he insist on making Gyges his confidant? Because, says Herodotus, it was written that Candaules should come to ruin. Justinus says,

"Hic uxorem, quam propter formae pulchritudinem deperiebat, praedicare omnibus solebat, non contentus voluptatum suarum tacita conscientia, nisi etiam matrimonii reticenda publicaret, prorsus quasi silentium damnum pulchritudinis esset." "Exactly as though silence were a diminution of her beauty."

After all, the rhetorician has explained much in a single phrase. So, too, Plutarch in a discussion on love says (*Quaest. Conviv.* I 5, 6):

"And though they take the greatest delight in looking at those they love they take no less delight in praising them than in looking at them. And love, garrulous as it is anyhow, is extremely so in the matter of praises. For lovers are themselves thoroughly persuaded, and they wish everybody else to be thoroughly persuaded, that those whom they love are beautiful and good. This is what roused the Lydian Candaules to induce Gyges into his apartment as a spectator. . . . For they wish their statements supported by the testimony of others."

The attitude is familiar enough. Many illustrations of it might be quoted, cp. for example Tibullus IV 13, 7-8 with my note:

nil opus invidia est, procul absit gloria vulgi:
qui sapit, in tacito gaudeat ille sinu.¹⁴

"The act of Candaules in exhibiting his wife as described by Herodotus and Justinus is quite credible. There is no reason for disbelieving a similar story which Suetonius tells of Caligula (25): *Caesoniam neque facie insigni neque aetate integra matremque iam ex alio viro trium filiarum, sed luxuriae ac lasciviae perditae, et ardentius et con-*

But, after all, the feelings of Candaules and, which is not generally taken into account, the feelings of Gyges are perhaps best described in Suckling's song in which we are told that:

If, when Dan Cupid's dart
Doth wound a heart,
We hide our grief
And shun relief,
The smart increaseth on that score;
For wounds unsearcht but rankle more.

Then if we whine, look pale,
And tell our tale,
Men are in pain
For us again;
So, neither speaking doth become
The lover's state, nor being dumb.

When this I do descry
Then thus think I:
etc., etc.

stantius amavit, ut saepe chlamyde peltaque et galea ornatam ac iuxta adequitantem militibus ostenderit, amicis vero etiam nudam. uxorio nomine dignatus est tquam enixam, uno atque eodem die professus et maritum se eius et patrem infantis ex ea natae. Nor for that matter is the type unknown to the mediaeval novelle of France and Italy. As Radet says: "Il n'y a rien d'anormal à ce qu'un souverain d'Orient se soit enorgueilli de son harem. Tout au contraire. Ensuite, dans cette frénésie d'enchantement qu'inspire à Candaule une forme admirable, il se pourrait qu'à la vanité amoureuse se mêlât quelque sentiment esthétique. Hérodote n'est pas seul à présenter le Sandonide comme un amateur du beau, passionnément épris du charme des lignes et des contours. C'est bien une physionomie d'artiste que Plinie lui attribue [XXXV 34, 2; VII 39, 1; cf. VII 57, 14]. . . . Candaule eut, à n'en pas douter, le goût des arts, et ce fut très probablement ce dilettantisme qui donna lieu à la tradition populaire dont Hérodote s'est fait l'écho" (*La Lydie et le monde grec au temps des Mermnades*, Paris, 1893, p. 131). It is this type of man which Gautier drew with great care in his well-known story 'Le Roi Candaule,' and which Hebbel attempted though with less success in his once famous play, *Gyges und sein Ring*. C. Fries, *Oriental. Lit.-Ztg.* 1910, 346 f. (cp. Lehmann-Haupt *PRE VII*, p. 1966) shows clearly enough that in this particular at least the folly of Candaules is an echo not of his dilettantism but of the old story of Ishtar, the Babylonian Venus. So far as the ancients were concerned, everyone was quite well aware that the type represented by Candaules, Caligula and their kind is not, and never has been, surprisingly rare. In this type, mere overweening pride of ownership—the impulse that

Three passages remain to be considered. The first is found in the speech of Aelius Aristides in Defence of Rhetoric (Orat. XLV 56—II, p. 74 Dindorf).

"My opponents claim," he says in substance, "that rhetoric incites to crime. The claim is ridiculous. On the contrary, it holds up to reprobation as nothing else can. Let us take the case of Gyges and Candaules. οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' εἰ Πλάτων οἶσται τούτοις ἐλέγχειν αὐτήν, ὦρα καὶ τὰ Γύγον τοῦ Λυδοῦ προσεγκαλεῖν αὐτῇ οἶμαι—ταῦτα μὲν ἐστὶ καὶ ἀτοπώτερα—ὅτι τὸν δεσπότην ἀποκτείνας ἔσχε τὴν ἀρχήν· ἡ δὲ συνήδει καὶ συνέπραττεν ἡ τοῦ μὲν γυνή, τοῦ δὲ δέσποινα."

In his funeral oration for the Emperor Julian (18, 294—II, p. 365 F), Libanius, after describing the ruin, the suffering, the desolation, which accompanied and followed the cruel and untimely death of his beloved friend and pupil, is moved, as well he may be, to inquire why such things are.

"It were nothing strange," he says in substance, "if in days like these any man might feel, as I feel, that never to die would be a penalty. And yet I did think that the gods ought to reward that marvelous man now gone, not with that penalty, but with children, with ripe old age, and length of dominion. They did not. On the other hand, there are the Lydian kings—all of them, my God, the seed of Gyges, him with the hands unclean. One of them reigned for thirty-nine years, another for fifty-seven; and he himself the impious guardsman for thirty-eight."

Again in Orat. 25, 69 (II 571 F), supporting his claim that slaves cannot be trusted, he says:

"A great many things teach me that lesson; among the rest, the Lydian guardsman who slew his master and took all he had, both his wife and his kingdom."

Note that the sentence ends much as does the concluding sentence of both Herodotus and Justinus.

These three passages are the only ones in which any emphasis whatever is laid upon the guilt of either Gyges or his accomplice. That this should be the case is a good illustration of the extraordinary conservatism of scholastic tradition.

It will be seen that so far as their later tradition is concerned, the experience of these two stories was much the same. Both of them lived in and by the schools. Even their Roman experi-

prompts the collector to exhibit some unique treasure, is quite sufficient in itself to explain the situation.

ence was parallel. There is no indication now that the passage of Herodotus was ever translated by any Roman, much less that it was ever known or used in the Roman schools. In fact, so far as I know, the Latin tradition of it begins and ends with the possible echo of a single phrase in Horace already discussed above. The only version of the story of Gyges to be found in Latin at all is by Justinus. It would be this version if any that would appear in the Roman schools. The story as Herodotus tells it is not calculated to appeal to the Roman mind, above all to the Roman professorial mind. The psychology of it is too unusual.

Now, of course, it would be ridiculous to assume from the testimony I have gathered that during all the long period from the death of Herodotus and Plato to the fall of the Eastern Empire there were not a great many people who read the two stories in question, quite apart from the fact that during all that time they appear to have been safely ensconced in the regular course of preliminary training which every educated man was supposed to have followed. Many people even in these days know more of Shakespeare and Milton than those selections which they were obliged to study when in college. The life of a great classic is by no means accurately gauged by the number of times it happens to be quoted or echoed in the later tradition of literary art. Nevertheless, the time always seems to come in the intellectual life of every nation when the classics are more talked about than read, when the only portions of them known at first hand are likely to be those which are included in the scheme of regular education, and therefore cannot be avoided or neglected. This investigation indicates, so far as it goes, that the last thousand years of the Graeco-Roman Empire were such a period. During all those centuries literary allusion to the great authors of the past often seems to be rich and varied. But when, among other things, we observe the regularity and the frequency with which certain stock phrases continue to recur, we realize that the richness and variety of such allusions are more apparent than real. Furthermore, if, following the method and scope of this investigation, we were to examine the pedigree of every such allusion and set aside all those that are clearly traceable to the schools, the residuum would hardly be visible, I suspect, to the naked eye.

As we have seen, thanks to the extraordinary conservatism and

vitality of scholastic training and apparently to them alone, the tradition of the two passages which we have been considering continued unbroken to the dawn of the Renaissance. With that great period of awakening and the return, after many ages, of the Greek Classics to the West, the life of our two passages like that of others loses scholastic support in the earlier sense, and thenceforth is to be traced for the most part in the literature of the modern languages. I subjoin here such references and echoes as I have happened to observe in the course of reading. Naturally a systematic and thorough search would reveal a great many more. Such as I have, however, are not without a certain interest and significance.

Let us first consider the story told by Plato. The earliest reference I have noticed to the ring of Gyges is found in Rabelais V 8:¹⁵

Auquel iour Pantagruel requeroit instamment veoir Papegaut: mais Aeditue respondit, qu'il ne se laissoit ainsi facilement veoir. Comment, dist Pantagruel, a-il l'armet de Pluton en teste, l'anneau de Gyges és griffes, ou vn Chameleon en sein, pour se rendre inuisible au monde?

The reference to the Cap of Hades in this connection suggests that Rabelais drew his information directly from Plato not from Cicero's translation of the story. His statement with regard to the chameleon goes back to Pliny, XXVIII 115.

Later references belong for the most part to the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries:

Guillaume Bouchet, *Les Serées*, vol. V, p. 20, Paris, Lemerre, 1881, in a discussion of the properties of various precious stones, says:

Et possible, adioustoit-il, que la pierre Siderite, dont nous parlons, se mouve naturellement au feu, comme l'Astriote se mouve dans le vinaigre, et font à croire à ceux qui regardent remuer ces pierres, que quelque esprit parle à eux, car quand nous ne pouvons rendre raison de quelque chose, et que la

¹⁵ Rings, jewels, and other charms conferring invisibility are frequently mentioned in mediaeval romances of chivalry and adventure. Most notable perhaps is the ring of Lunet (*Chrestien de Troyes*, *Yvain*, 1057 ff.). Lunet might have inherited it from Gyges; at all events, *Chrestien* was probably well acquainted with *Cicero*. But no definite connection can be shown.

Nature se peut cognoistre, tout incontinent nous iugeons y avoir en cela quelque divinité, ou quelque mistere occulte, dont on ne peut rendre raison, comme en l'Anneau de Gyges Roy des Lidiens, auquel y avoit vne pierre, qui avoit telle vertu que tournée vers luy, il voyoit tout ce qu'il vouloit, sans estre veu.

Du Bellay, *Les Amours*, XX:

Je souhaite plustost pour voir ce beau visage
Où le ciel a posé son plus parfaict ouvrage
L'anneau qui fait en Roy transformer un Berger.

Robert Greene (?), *Selimus*, line 2126:

We thought you had old Gyges' wondrous ring,
That so you were invisible to us.

Beaumont and Fletcher, *Fair Maid of the Inn*, I 1:

Why, did you think that you had Gyges' ring,
Or the herb that gives invisibility?

Ben Jonson, *New Inn*, I 1:

Fer. Because indeed I had
No medicine, sir, to go invisible,
No fernseed in my pocket nor an opal,
Wrought in bay leaf, in my left fist, to charm
Their eyes with.

Host. He does give you reasons, sir,
As round as Gyges' ring, which, say the ancients,
Was a hoop ring.

John Marston, *Satyres*, I 5; *Works*, ed. Bullen, III 263:

Tell me, brown Ruscus, hast thou Gyges' ring,
That thou presum'st as if thou wert unseen?

Id., *The Fawn*, III 1; *Works*, II 170:

What, did he think to walk invisibly before our eyes? And he had Gyges' ring I would find him.

George Chapman, *Monsieur d'Olive*, II 1 [London, Pearson, 1, p. 212]:

As private as I had King Gyges' ring
And could have gone invisible, yet saw all.

Id., *ibid.*, V 1 [p. 247]:

Let him enjoy the benefit of the enchanted ring, and stand a while invisible: at our best opportunity we'll discover him to the Duke.

Robert Herrick, *Hesperides*, begins his poem "Lovers how they come and part" with:

A Gyges ring they beare about them still,
To be, and not, seen when and where they will.

M. Delrio, *Disquisitiones Magicae*, Moguntiae, 1624, p. 186:

Sic fraude daemonum Domitiani oculis se subtraxit Apollonius [apud] Philostratum, sic Gyges latebat fictitio illo tectus annulo apud Ciceronem, sic de Persei clypeo Graeculi fabulantur.

In her Artamène ou le Grand Cyrus (Paris, 1649-1653), Mlle de Scudéry makes one of her characters, the king of Pontus, possessor of the ring of Gyges. Mandane falls into his power but is finally rescued by the hero. See Dunlop-Wilson, II, p. 435 and note.

References in modern writers seem to turn up in unlikely places. For example, Mary Johnston, *Sir Mortimer*, 1904, p. 33, presumably imitating Lyly's euphuism, says:

Ulysses took Moly in his hand when there came to meet him Circe's gentlemen pensioners, and Gyges' ring not only saved him from peril but brought him wealth and great honor.

And we are told by Warwick Deeping, *Uther and Igraine*, 1903, p. 244, that:

Staunch sympathy like Gige's (*sic*) ring has power over most hidden things of the heart, and Gorlois was very human.

Finally, in *Elinor Glyn's Three Weeks*, p. 65, Paul's 'lady friend' tells him that:

We will rob Mercure (*sic*) of his sandals and Gyges of his ring.

Sir Thomas Browne, *Pseudodoxia Epidemica*, VII, chap. 18:

If anyone makes a doubt of Giges' ring in Iustinus . . . for my part I shall not be angry with his incredulity.

The Doctor means Cicero, of course. The mistake is not uncommon.

On the whole—and, after all, this is quite natural—the story told by Herodotus seems to have made a deeper impression on the modern world than has the story of Plato. Herodotus was translated into French by Saliat in 1575 and into English by "B. R." (books I and II) in 1584; for his translation of this passage see Roberts' note on Dionysius of Halicarnassus on *Literary Composition*, London, 1910, pp. 82 ff. The story, however, had already been freely told after Herodotus by Painter in the sixth

tale of his "Pallace of Pleasure," 1566. Not far from the same date, Nicolao Granucci in his *Piacevol Notte, et Lieto Giorno*, Venetia, Vidali, 1574, p. 48 *verso*, speaking of the misfortunes of Croesus and their causes, retells the story of the king's ancestor, Gyges, as related by Herodotus.

Robert Greene, *The Carde of Fancie*, Works, ed. Grosart, vol. IV, p. 39, among many traditional examples cited of the woes that men suffer on account of women says:

Candaules was slaine by his murthering wife whom so intirelie he loued.

John Lyly, *Euphues*, vol. I, p. 210, Bond:

Tush, the case is lyght where reason taketh place; to love and to lyve well, is not graunted to Iupiter.¹⁶ Who so is blinded with the caule of beautie, decerneth no coulour of honestie. Did not Giges cut Candaules a coate by his owne measure?

In his *Anatomy of Melancholy*, III, p. 353 (Shilleto), speaking of the vagaries of lovers, Burton says:

In the other extreme some are too liberal, as the proverb is, *turdus ipse malum sibi cacat*, they made a rod for their own tails, as Candaules did to Gyges in Herodotus, commend his wife's beauty himself, and besides would needs have him see her naked.

In the old play of *Elvira* (Dodsley-Hazlitt, XV, p. 9) Digby says:

It were a wonder worthy of your wit,
To make me trust my ears before my eyes.

But neither this nor Lucretius V 100-103 is likely to have been an echo of the familiar Herodotean phrase.¹⁷

Such a line as

A happie starre made Giges ioie attaine

(*Paradise of Dayntie Devises*, p. 114, Collier), might have been suggested by either Plato or Herodotus, it is impossible to say which.

¹⁶ Bond forgets to mention in his note that this phrase is an echo of Publilius Syrus'

Amare et sapere vix deo conceditur.

¹⁷ Cp. Tennyson, *Enoch Arden*, 762, and see Mustard, *Classical Echoes* in Tennyson, p. 142.

Among imitations of Herodotus, the most notable perhaps is Lafontaine's conte, "Le Roi Candaule et le Maître en droit." Bouret's "L'Imprudence de Candaule," written at about the same time, is less known and not easily obtainable. I, therefore, subjoin the text here (*Anthologie Satyrique*, V, p. 51):

Jambe, genou, cuisse, téton, épaule,
 Tout en la reine est ouvrage parfait,
 Ami Gygès, disait un jour Candaule;
 Rien de plus beau la nature n'a fait.
 Sur son gent corps qui n'a rien qui ne plaise,
 Je voudrais bien savoir ton sentiment,
 Caché seras en lieu d'où bien à l'aise
 Apprécieras cet objet si charmant.
 Il tint parole. O le plus fou des hommes!
 Ton imprudence aveugle alla trop loin.
 Mais aux maris dans le siècle où nous sommes,
 Femmes l'on voit épargner un tel soin.

In both these versions, the attitude towards the characters is that of Justinus. It is the characteristic attitude of the Latin races.¹⁸

Baldassar Scaramelli (*Novelle*, Carmagnola, 1585) tells a story much like that of Herodotus or rather of Justinus. It is not likely, however, that it owes anything to either of them. The plot as stated by Scaramelli himself is as follows:

Un cavalier Pisano avendo per moglie la più bella donna di quel tempo, s'invoglia farla veder nuda a un suo lealissimo amico. Ella ciò nega, ond'egli a suo malgrado di nascosto fa vederla: del che la donna accortasi, dall'istesso che la vide fa goderse, e ciò per far dispetto al suo marito.

Modern versions of the story begin in the first half of the nineteenth century. The best known are Théophile Gautier's "Le Roi Candaule," a short story, and F. Hebbel's "Gyges und sein Ring," a tragedy. Less known, but an excellent piece of work, is Robert Lytton's narrative poem "Gyges and Candaules" (*Chronicles and Characters*, London, 1868, vol. I, p. 66). Equally good is "Gyges's Ring," a dramatic monologue, New York, 1901, the first published work, I believe, of Rupert

¹⁸ Brantôme, *Dames Galantes*, I, p. 64 (Jouaust), combines the two stories. The note ad loc. cites Cicero's version, but the source was Justinus and possibly Herodotus.

Hughes. André Gide's tragedy, "*Le Roi Candaule*," appeared in the same year. It is the last, and in some respects the best, of all the modern versions. Finally, I may mention, merely for the sake of completing the record, C. W. Lisle's "*Ring of Gyges, Some Passages in the Life of Francis Neville*," London, Bentley, 1886. The story seems to have been suggested more or less vaguely by a hasty reading, on the part of the author, of Gautier's version. Otherwise it is perhaps sufficiently described by the statement that it ought to, and probably did, belong to Mudie's Select Library of Fiction. At all events I, myself, never saw it but once. That was in the drawing-room of the vicarage in a village in the south of England.

By way of concluding this long investigation, I should like to call attention to two points which it illustrates and which, it seems to me, are so characteristic that they deserve to be mentioned here. The first is the extraordinary fidelity of Antiquity to type; the second is the difference between the ancient and modern way of considering and developing a story like this.

When Herodotus took this tale out of the irresponsible atmosphere of Fairy Land, he developed it on the lines of Greek tragedy. In fact, it is actually a parallel in prose to such dramas as the *Agamemnon* or the *Œdipus Tyrannus*. As such, the protagonist, the hero, is not Gyges; much less, is it the Queen; it is Candaules. The story, therefore, as Herodotus tells it, is not the Rise of Gyges, as it was in the old Fairy Tale, but the Fall of Candaules. Observe that in this respect the situation as it was in the old Fairy Tale is exactly reversed. On the other hand, the two are as nearly alike as possible in one important respect, viz., no particular blame, comparatively speaking, attaches to any of the characters. In the old folk tale this is due to the atmospheric effect of Fairy Land. Fairy Land is an utterly unmoral country. The adventurer, Gyges, and his accomplice, the Queen, outwit and destroy the brutal and foolish giant, Candaules; and the precious pair live happily ever after on the fruit of their combined labors. So, in Herodotus, the characters are all worthy of the situation. No one blames Candaules for a madness which the gods have sent upon him and which drives him to his doom as inexorably as it raises Gyges to his high estate. Even the Queen herself is only an instrument of Destiny. In other words, if Herodotus chose to

remould and rationalize the story on the lines of the Tragedy, it was because he believed that the old tradition depicting the characters as blameless actually reflected the truth. In this respect the tradition established by Herodotus lasted until the very end of antiquity. The three exceptions quoted on page 28 are more apparent than real. The first two were used by the speaker merely for the purpose of scoring a rhetorical point, and the third only as an illustration of what Barbey d'Aurevilly might have termed '*Le bonheur dans le crime.*' Even Justinus does not depart altogether from the Herodotean conception. His story of Candaules, Gyges, and the Queen is the story of a fool and two knaves. But the fool is such an utter fool, that one can hardly blame either him for his folly or the knaves who profit by it.

Modern versions all differ from Herodotus in one respect. The protagonist is always Gyges, never Candaules. The queen, too, is much more prominent than she was in antiquity.

The effects of this difference are more subtle and far-reaching than at first sight they appear to be. As Herodotus tells the story, the theme is the folly of Candaules and its punishment. Candaules is an illustration of that mysterious and relentless power of Ate, which is so characteristic of the Tragedy and of the Hellenic conception of sin and its consequences. Did Candaules suffer for his own sin? Or for that of some ancestor? Who can tell? *Χρὴν γὰρ Κανδαύλῃ γενέσθαι κακῶς* is all that Herodotus ventures to say. It is quite certain that every Greek who read the story of Herodotus, took it for granted that the curse did not and could not die with Candaules. Though caught in the net of relentless circumstances and driven as it were to execute perforce the decree of Destiny, Gyges and the Queen cannot go scot free. The curse lives on, and the day will surely come when they or their descendants must pay the bill in full.

For Herodotus, however, all this was subsidiary, and so much of it could be taken for granted that a passing reference was all that was necessary. Nevertheless, it is just this subsidiary portion that appeals to the essentially modern reader, and to which the modern writer when telling the same story has always given the greatest prominence. As we tell the tale, the hero is always Gyges, never Candaules.

On the whole, these modern versions have been remarkably

successful; but the psychology of the story, if Gyges is the hero, is more difficult and more complicated, and the artistic simplicity of Herodotus is altogether impossible. Nor is this the only difficulty. The fact is that some of the best stories in the world's literature are also the shortest. In most cases a page or two apiece is quite enough. Yet short as they are, they are told with such skill, they so fire the imagination of the reader, that it is often long before we realize that they always suffer by being retold at greater length or in more detail. Silvio Pellico, George Boker, Stephen Phillips, Gabriele d'Annunzio, and how many others have told at length the story of Francesca and Paolo. Which one of them would have told it at all, if it had not been for the immortal version of Dante? And Dante tells it in scarcely a dozen lines. If we could have but one of all these versions, which would we choose, and why? The tragedy of Candaulus, as Herodotus wrote it, belongs to the same class. The story covers less than two pages. But this, too, is after all unique and unapproachable.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

II.—WHY WERE THE JEWS BANISHED FROM ITALY IN 19 A. D.?

Historians have been aware that Tiberius, probably at the instance of Sejanus, had the Roman Senate banish the Jews and take other severe measures against them; but nobody has explained the action. It appears indeed to be regarded as a matter destined to remain a mystery for want of sufficient information.

The data are in fact scanty; a careful study of them may however extract the explanation which every student of history must desire. The affair is mentioned by a number of ancient writers, but practically we are dependent on the reports of Josephus and Tacitus.

We begin naturally with Josephus, whose account is more detailed. After relating the sad events which befell in Judea during the governorship of Pilate, he says (*Ant.* 18. 3. 4): "About the same time another dread calamity threw the Jews into confusion, and certain transactions not devoid of disgrace befell in the sanctuary of Isis at Rome. After I shall have recorded the bold attempt of the devotees of Isis, I will direct my story to what occurred among the Jews." He then recounts the outrage committed by one Decius Mundus, a Roman knight, upon Paulina, a Roman lady of high rank and exemplary character, who was the wife of Saturninus, a man of like rank and character. This Decius, consumed with a guilty passion for Paulina, had sought without success to seduce her by bribes to satisfy his desires. Failing in this he had resolved to terminate his life by starvation, but was dissuaded from his purpose by one of his freedwomen, who promised to procure for him the object of his passion. The terms agreed upon, the procuress, knowing that Paulina was a devotee of the Egyptian cult, conspired against her honor with certain priests of Isis, who reported to the great lady that they had had a revelation from the god Anubis bidding her come to the sanctuary to dine with him and enjoy his embraces. The devout Paulina, overjoyed at this signal proof of the divine favor, after obtaining the consent of her husband, repaired to the shrine, where she spent the night

in the arms of the supposed god. Taunted subsequently by Mundus with having granted him in the guise of Anubis what she had previously refused, she disclosed the horrid imposture to her husband, and he in turn reported it to Tiberius. The Emperor, after due inquiry, ordered the temple of Isis demolished, the cult-statue of the goddess cast into the Tiber, the priests and the procuress crucified, and the guilty knight banished.

This narrative concluded, Josephus resumes, "Such were the insolent deeds of the priests in the temple of Isis. Now I return to relate what befell the Jews at Rome at this time, as my account promised before." Thereupon he recounts the tale as follows. A worthless Jew, a fugitive from justice in Judea, conspiring with three equally worthless accomplices and giving out that he expounded the wisdom of the law of Moses, persuaded one Fulvia, a Roman lady of quality who was a proselyte to Judaism, to contribute purple and gold for the temple at Jerusalem; but the men diverted her gifts to their own uses. Tiberius, informed of the matter by Fulvia's husband, who likewise bore the name of Saturninus, ordered all the Jews banished from Rome; and the consuls drafted four thousand of the men and sent them to Sardinia, inflicting severe punishment on a large number who refused to serve in the army lest they be compelled in the service to violate the Jewish law. Thus the Jews were banished from Rome because of the wickedness of four men.

On reading the account of the Jewish historian one gains the impression of a great calamity visited upon a people for a trifling offense. If one doubts the sufficiency of his explanation, —and modern historians have of course doubted it,—one may perhaps conclude that the real cause of these severe measures was the deep-seated animosity against the Jews fostered by their reputation for exclusiveness and their assumption of superior righteousness: a parallel on a vast scale to the ostracism of Aristides. Nevertheless one instinctively questions whether Tiberius, who by Josephus's own account instituted an inquiry before taking the measures of state consequent on the affair of Paulina, could have acted in the case of the Jews without reasons which seemed to him good and sufficient, even if urged to drastic action by Sejanus and others who may have been swayed by prejudice. We shall presently see that the very narrative of Josephus suggests something more than appears upon its face.

We seek in vain for further light on the affair from other Jewish sources. Philo does indeed refer to the matter without giving any information. In *Flaccum*, c. 1, he merely mentions Sejanus as one who has persecuted the Jews: unfortunately the portion of this work which dealt with him has been lost—possibly destroyed of set purpose. In his *Legatio ad Gaium*, cc. 23-24, he does not specify the charges brought against the Jews, but lays stress on the circumstance that but few were implicated in the affair, thus confirming, though in terms less precise, the statement of Josephus that there were only four offenders.

Of Roman writers Suetonius also (*Tiberius*, cc. 35-36) yields nothing of importance because of the vagueness of his statement, which is moreover to all appearances based on the account of Tacitus. In fact Josephus alone mentions the charge against the Jews. Nevertheless it is not unimportant to consider the narrative of Tacitus. We have observed how closely Josephus links the cases of Paulina and Fulvia, though the connection between them indicated by the Jewish historian is merely that of coincidence in time and the parallel is apparently drawn with a view to contrast the insolent outrage of the Egyptians with the venial offense of the Jews.

The Roman historian, too, links the Egyptians and the Jews together in this matter, but quite contrary to what Josephus suggests clearly imputes the greater blame to the latter. Moreover he obviously considers the question as one of unholy rites, which he must have regarded as essentially the same, since he identifies them outright. Indeed, Tacitus not only connects the case of the Jews with that of the Egyptians so intimately as to suggest their practical identity, but he also brings both into the closest relation to the measures adopted by the Roman senate to restrain the licentiousness of women. "The same year," he says (*Annals*, 2. 85), "the licentiousness of women was curbed by severe decrees of the senate, and measures were taken to prevent the venal prostitution of any woman whose grandfather, father, or husband was a Roman knight; for Vistilia, the daughter of a praetor, had made public profession of prostitution before the aediles pursuant to an ancient custom which regarded the confession of shame a sufficient penalty for the unchaste. Her husband Titidius Labeo was brought to question, why in view of his wife's manifest guilt he had failed to enforce the

legal penalty. As he excused himself by pointing out that the term of sixty days allowed for the institution of legal proceedings had not yet elapsed, it was held to suffice if Vistilia were dealt with: she was accordingly banished to the isle of Seriphos. The question also of expelling the Egyptian and Jewish cults was laid before the senate; and it was decreed that four thousand freedmen tainted with that superstition, who were of the proper age, should be deported to Sardinia in order to put down brigandage there, with the thought that if they perished because of the severity of the climate it were small loss; the remainder should depart from Italy unless before a given date they renounced their unholy rites."

Since the total number of four thousand men drafted into the army, according to Tacitus, is precisely that mentioned by Josephus as the Jewish contingent, this passage makes it clear that the measures of the senate were directed chiefly—almost exclusively—against the Jews. The Egyptians here cut an unimportant figure. The action is brought into relation with the steps taken to curb the licentiousness of women, but is clearly distinguished from those concerned with venal prostitution, and connected with religious rites which the historian denounces as unholy. So far as Tacitus may have had in mind the story of Paulina, which we get from Josephus, it is clear that she was not guilty of venal prostitution; which agrees with his distinction. Her case was one of prostitution, indeed, but of a different sort, connected with unholy rites. In the eyes of Tacitus, and presumably in the eyes of the Roman authorities, the Jewish rites were identical with the Egyptian. Moreover, the account of Josephus makes it clear that the cases of Paulina and Fulvia in so far resembled that of Vistilia as they also were Roman ladies of equestrian or senatorial families, whose licentiousness the various measures were intended to curb.

Vistilia was guilty of venal prostitution. Paulina was guilty, however excusably, of religious prostitution. Regarding Fulvia we are left in doubt, because Tacitus, while treating the Egyptians and Jews as practically identical, does not specify the charges in either case, and Josephus, while linking them closely together, represents the offense of his co-religionists as extremely venial. Nevertheless the presumption is obviously very strong

that in the eyes of the Romans the affair of Fulvia was not unlike that of Paulina. Have we, then, no means of determining the charges preferred against the Jews and accepted as established by the Roman authorities?

We have seen that Josephus represents the offense of the Jews as consisting in the misappropriation by certain Jewish impostors of gifts solicited from Fulvia with the understanding that they were to be sent to the temple at Jerusalem. It may possibly occur to someone that in accordance with the decrees of Augustus (Josephus, *Ant.*, 16. 6. 2-5) such conduct might be interpreted as sacrilege. This explanation would, however, be certainly at fault, because the decrees in question had in view the possible seizure of Jewish contributions by Greeks, individuals or states, and provided that the guilty should be delivered over to the Jews for punishment. To the Roman mind, we may add, such sacrilege—even granting that it would have been so accounted—practiced by a Jewish outlaw against the ‘unholy sanctities’ of the Jewish ‘superstition’ could scarcely have sufficed to justify the authorities in taking measures so drastic and embittered.

Now Josephus says that the contribution of Fulvia consisted of gold and purple for the temple at Jerusalem: to what use they were to be put, he does not say. Every student of Hebrew antiquities, however, must recognize at once that the gold and purple were intended for the hangings of the temple. This fact, as we shall see, when duly considered, affords the necessary clew; for if one examines the history of these hangings and notes their inevitable suggestions to the minds of Asiatic and European peoples of antiquity, the interpretation put upon the solicitation of such gifts is not difficult to comprehend.

The Priestly code represents the hangings of the temple as derived from those of the ‘tent of meeting’ constructed by direction of Jehovah for the housing of the ark of the covenant during the journeyings of Israel in the wilderness. Modern scholars are agreed, however, that the ‘tent of meeting’ is in fact nothing but a fictitious replica of the temple supposedly adapted to the nomadic life of the desert, though its construction is such that it could not have been used as the story represents. Nevertheless, before there was a temple proper there was in fact

a 'tent of meeting,' probably not unlike the sukkah¹ of the festivals that furnished the concrete basis out of which Hebrew legend reconstructed the mythical account of the Exodus. It might be shown, if one chose to avail oneself of the requisite space, that the tent of the ḥag was in earlier times the tent of *rendez-vous* or of assignation, in which the people at their festivals met by appointment the divinity or his representatives. Such tents of assignation are still in use in the pilgrimages of Islam at Mecca, and are known to have been constructed and afterwards burned on the 'tent-day' of the triduan festival of Isis at Tithorea in Phocis. The context of Pausanias, to whom we owe our information (10. 32. 14-18), suggests that the same was true of the rites of Isis held at Coptus in Egypt. The tent of meeting or assignation was often connected with the shrine of the god, most commonly on its roof, whence hierodules received the name 'prostitutes on the roof.' Whether at Rome, in the case of Paulina, the meeting occurred in the upper chamber or in some other, we do not learn from Josephus. Even now a sukkah may be attached to a synagogue, though its primitive use is doubtless forgotten. However, the union of Paulina with Anubis in the chamber of the temple of Isis was unquestionably regarded by her as a rite of initiation of a certain degree. In fact, as I hope to show on another occasion, initiation was in ancient times always in form either a nuptial or a prenuptial rite, in which the divinity might be represented by a human substitute. Hence there cannot have been anything irregular about the case of Paulina except the intrusion of an unauthorized representative of the god in the person of Mundus, who procured the privilege by bribery. So much for the 'tents' or hangings of the temple.

As may be shown by numerous instances from various lands, the weaving of these tents or hangings fell to the female hierodules, who were sometimes entrusted to the safe-keeping of male hierodules or eunuchs. It will suffice here to cite an example from the Old Testament, which shows that the practice was not

¹ The 'tent' (אֹהֶל) of meeting' did not differ essentially from the sukkah, as is shown by Hosea 12, 9. The 'tent' was conceived as an upper chamber resting upon the house of Jehovah (Exodus 26, 7); cp. the temple of Bel, Herod. 1. 181.

unknown in Israel. Among the reforms of King Josiah it is recorded (ii. Kings 23, 7) that "he brake down the houses (tents) of the sodomites, that were in the house of Jehovah, where the women wove hangings (tents) for the Asherah." These 'women' were unquestionably hierodules or temple prostitutes, entrusted to the safe-keeping of eunuchs.²

It will be urged by way of objection that whatever might have been true of ancient Israel, so long as the influence of the cults of the Baalim made itself felt, such conduct as is here supposed to have been imputed to the Jews in the case of Fulvia was unthinkable in Judaism at the beginning of the Christian era. Had not the reforms of King Josiah, and the Deuteronomic and Priestly codes intervened and effectively purged the temple at Jerusalem? It is not necessary for our argument to prove that the ancient practices actually were continued: it would equally well suffice if it were merely shown that they were familiar enough from other Semitic cults to lead the Roman authorities to interpret the advances of the Jews to Fulvia as solicitation to become a temple prostitute. But it is in fact a questionable assumption that the abuses against which the Prophets inveighed and the Law provided penalties were ever wholly done away before the destruction of the second temple; for even if the efforts at reform had succeeded, there were many circumstances that tended of necessity to re-introduce practices not consonant with the loftier ideals of the Jewish people. It may be questioned whether orthodox Judaism ever for long dominated the population of Palestine. Judaism was a church among many dissenters, not a few of whom were reckoned as its members. Since the enforced conversion of the Idumaeans in the time of John Hyrcanus there must have been large numbers of professed Jews who continued the ancient heathen practices within or without the temple at Jerusalem. Truly there were many called Jews who were not the chosen people of Jehovah.

² For the existence of hierodules in Israel see Stade, *Bibl. Theologie des Alt. Testaments* I, pp. 133 sq. He omits, however, the significant passage (Num. 31, 40) about the thirty-two virgins who fell to Jehovah from the spoil of the Midianites. They cannot have been regarded otherwise than as hierodules. The passage is, however, recognized as a very late addition to P. Hence the fact that hierodules in the service of Jehovah are here taken as a matter of course is perhaps the strongest evidence of the persistence of the institution in Judaism.

These are general considerations deserving of being duly weighed; but it is not necessary to rest the case here, as there is specific evidence of the greatest value. The non-canonical Christian gospels of the nativity supply testimony which cannot well be impugned on the ground of bad faith or prejudice. A quotation from the *Protevangelium of James* (cc. 10-11) will suffice to show that the practice of pre-exilic times was not thought to be impossible in the time of Augustus. "And there was held a council of the priests," we read, "saying, Let us make a veil for the temple of the Lord. And the priest said, Call me undefiled virgins of the tribe of David; and the servitors departed and sought, and they found seven virgins. And the priest bethought him of the child Mary, that she was of the tribe of David and undefiled unto the Lord, and the servitors went and brought her. And they led the virgins into the temple of the Lord and the priest said, Determine me by lot who shall weave the gold, and the white, and the byssus, and the silk, and the blue, and the scarlet, and the true purple. And the true purple and the scarlet fell to the lot of Mary, and she took it and went to her house.³ And at that time Zacharias was dumb, and Samuel served in his stead until Zacharias spake. And Mary took the scarlet and span it. And she took her pitcher and went out to fill it with water;⁴ and lo, a voice, saying, Hail, thou that hast found favor, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. And she looked round to right and left, wondering whence the voice came. And she went away trembling to her house, and rested the pitcher, and seated herself on her chair, taking the purple, and drew it out. And lo, an angel of the Lord stood before her

³ The word is *olkos*, but it may well mean tent: cf. the *ֹלֶכֶת* of the sodomites, ii. Kings 23, 7, the same word as is used for the 'hangings' of the Asherah. Gen. 27, 15 it means a tent (LXX. *olkos*). Pseudo-Matthew represents Mary and her five virgin companions as lodging in the 'house' of Joseph, whom the non-canonical gospels represent as a priest, chosen for this service by a device modelled on the procedure in the case of Aaron.

⁴ Myth and legend know no insignificant details; whatever they relate is included because it has a meaning, though we may not be able in every instance to determine it. It is probable that the water was to serve for the bridal bath. Mary was to be the bride both of God and of Joseph.

saying, Fear not, Mary: for thou hast found favor before the Lord of All; and thou shalt conceive according to His word."

Can any one question that this account represents Mary as a hierodule, the bride of the Lord of All, meeting Him or His angel in her 'house' in the temple at Jerusalem? Observe that it was while she was there engaged in spinning the true purple for the veil of the temple that there was brought to her by a messenger of the Lord the beatific annunciation of the divine favor which was to make her indeed the virgin bride of the Lord of All and the mother of the Saviour. Whether or not such a thing actually occurred from time to time in the temple at Jerusalem, we need not pause at present to inquire. It requires no proof that devout Christians of Syria, many of whom must have been converted Jews, during the second century of the Christian era not only conceived it as possible, but founded their faith in part on the belief that in the case of Mary it was a literal fact.

One readily sees that the story of Paulina, as related by Josephus, and that of Fulvia, as we are thus enabled to reconstruct it, are quite as closely parallel as our analysis of the historical data would lead us to expect. The connection of Fulvia with the purple⁵ destined for the temple at Jerusalem suggests the character of the hopes which may well have been held out to her by the Jewish impostors. At all events there was abundant justification for the interpretation of their conduct if Tiberius regarded it as solicitation to turn temple prostitute.

If we take this view of the affair of Fulvia we have an adequate explanation of the data. The measures of the Roman authorities and the practical identification of the Egyptian and Jewish rites in the account of Tacitus become intelligible. There remains the cause for the persecution of the Jews alleged by Josephus. On the view here suggested the statement of the Jewish historian is indeed inadequate, as every thoughtful reader must have found it; but it gives at least a part of the truth. If Josephus did not tell the whole story, it may be that he was

⁵ Pseudo-Matthew, c. 9, enlarges on the significance of the purple. Because it falls to Mary her companions tauntingly call her the queen of the virgins; but an angel appears and declares that the purple is a prophecy, not a subject for taunting. The prophecy is fulfilled by the angel of the annunciation.

unwilling to relate details which must inevitably compromise his people; but it may be, also, that he honestly held that the sole offense actually proved against his guilty co-religionists was that of misappropriating the contributions solicited from Fulvia for the behoof of the temple. Be that as it may, the Roman authorities, interpreting and weighing the evidence, might with good reason have felt justified in regarding the cases of Paulina and Fulvia as at least in intention parallel, and might deem the Jews more obnoxious than the Egyptians because of their well known zeal in proselytizing the women of Rome.

W. A. HEIDEL.

III.—A PUN IN THE *RHETORIC* OF ARISTOTLE.

In the standard text of Roemer (1885) a troublesome passage in Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3. 11. 1412a 33-1412b 3, reads thus:

τὰ δὲ παρὰ γράμμα ποιεῖ οὐχ ὃ λέγει λέγειν, ἀλλ' ὃ μεταστρέφει ὄνομα, οἷον τὸ Θεοδώρου εἰς Νίκωνα τὸν κιθαρωδόν, 'θράττει σε'· προσποιεῖται γὰρ λέγειν τὸ 'θράττει σε' καὶ ἐξαπατᾷ· ἄλλο γὰρ λέγει. διὸ μαθόντι ἡδύ, ἐπεὶ εἰ μὴ ὑπολαμβάνει Θράκα εἶναι, οὐ δόξει ἀστείον εἶναι.

The paraphrase of this, and the note on it, in the Cope-Sandys edition of the *Rhetoric* (1877) run as follows:

"Pleasantries arising from changes of letters (plays on words) are produced, not by a mere enunciation of a word in its direct meaning, but by something (a change) which gives a different *turn* to it, (converts or twists it into a different sense); as that of Theodorus (of Byzantium, the rhetorician . . .) against Nicon the harper, *θράττει*: he pretends namely to say 'it confounds you' (you are confounded), and cheats; for he means something else: and therefore it is amusing only after one has become acquainted with the meaning (or circumstances); for if (the hearer) doesn't know that he is a Thracian, he will see no point in it at all."

'Victorius and Schrader have both missed the meaning of this pun. But in order to arrive at it, we must first remove from the text the first *σε* after *θράττει* which has been introduced from the second (where it is required) and spoils the pun. Nicon, it appears from the explanation, is, or is supposed to be, of foreign extraction; and not only that, but a Thracian, the most barbarous of all nations. The Thracian women were habitually slaves, in Athenian families: Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 279, 280, 284, 293; *Pac.* 1138; *Vesp.* 828. This person is addressed by Theodorus with the word *θράττει*, which means *apparently*, "You are confounded"; this appears from the interpretation that follows, (*τι*) *θράττει σε*, which is of course convertible in meaning with the passive *θράττει* (and it follows also that the first *σε* must be an error of the transcriber, for *θράττει σε* would be no interpretation of *θράττει σε*; nor in that form would there be any

pun). It *really* means, however, $\Theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau' \epsilon\iota$, "You are a Thracian maid-servant"—not only an out-and-out barbarian, but effeminate to boot, and a menial. Schrader's explanation is " $\Theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\eta$ (sic) $\sigma\epsilon$, hoc est, *Thracia mulier te*, intellige *peperit*"—at once impossible in respect of the Greek, and pointless. Victorius to much the same effect.'

Meineke would find in line 35 $\Theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau' \eta\sigma\epsilon$. Cope, as we see, would delete $\sigma\epsilon$ in line 35. Welldon in his translation (1886) follows Cope. Jebb in his posthumously published translation (ed. by Sandys, 1909) reads $\theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon$ in line 35, and $\theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota \sigma\epsilon$ in line 36, without making clear his conception of the joke; in his foot-note Sandys adds: 'Cobet suggested $\Theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\eta\varsigma \epsilon\iota$; Susemihl $\Theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$, "he is playing the Thracian" (the "other meaning," according to Jebb), or $\Theta\rho\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota \sigma\epsilon$, "it makes you play the Thracian."' On this showing, there is a presumption that the joke has not been caught; and an alteration of the text is probably demanded. My explanation has at least this merit, that it requires a slighter change (if any) of text than those hitherto put forward; for, if a change is to be made, I ask only that the final ϵ be replaced in both cases by υ , or at most that the final ϵ be in both cases deleted.

Cope's explanation of the word-play is doubtless correct so far as concerns the idea, 'You are a Thracian quean'—menial, effeminate, and of barbarous foreign extraction; this I shall hereafter refer to as Idea No. 2. But it may be less easy to accept his rendering of the other, primary aspect of the pun (Idea No. 1): 'You are confounded'—which hardly makes sense enough (unless, with Meineke, we suppose an occasion when musical instruments were sounding); whereas this and other illustrative jokes in Aristotle we should expect to be full of wit. Let us consider a few details of the note by Cope, of the passage, and of the context.

To begin with, the pleasantry is hardly one made by Theodorus the rhetorician at the expense of Nikon. If Aristotle has taken it from the *Rhetoric* of Theodorus, it is simply one recorded in that work; from 3. 11. 1412a 25-29 ($\kappa\alpha\iota \delta \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota \Theta\epsilon\acute{o}\delta\omega\rho\omicron\varsigma$, $\tau\acute{o} \kappa\alpha\iota\nu\acute{\alpha} \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$. $\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \delta\epsilon \sigma\tau\alpha\nu \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\chi\omicron\nu \eta\eta$, $\kappa\alpha\iota \mu\acute{\eta}$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\varsigma \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$, $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma \tau\acute{\eta}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\theta\epsilon\nu \delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha\nu$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \acute{\omega}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho \omicron\acute{\iota} \acute{\epsilon}\nu \tau\omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma \gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\varsigma \tau\acute{\alpha} \pi\alpha\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\pi\omicron\eta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$, $\acute{\omicron}\pi\epsilon\rho \delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\alpha} \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha} \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\mu\mu\alpha \sigma\acute{\kappa}\acute{\omega}\mu\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ 'ἐξαπατᾷ γάρ.¹)

¹ In Jebb's translation (p. 173): 'The like is true of what Theodorus

we may infer that the jokes explained by Theodorus were to some extent drawn from the comic poets. How easy it is to go astray in the precise attribution of a joke found in Aristotle may be seen in Jebb's rendering of *Rhetoric* 3. 10. 1411a 18-21: 'Or, take the iambic line of Anaxandrides about the delay of his daughters to get married—

The bridals of my girls are overdue.'

The daughters (τῶν θυγατέρων) are the maidens (αἱ παρθένοι) of Anaxandrides only in the sense that they figured in a comedy by this poet; the mode of allusion in Aristotle points to an important episode in some familiar play.²

An intrusive σε (or any intrusive particle or letter) from the hand of a napping copyist would be more likely to appear as a faulty repetition in the second occurrence (line 36) of the expression θάττει σε than as a faulty anticipation in the first (line 35); having written both words once, the scribe might inadvertently repeat them both. But we need not imagine a scribal error either of anticipation or repetition, for, whatever the original reading, a repetition may be correct. Supposing for the moment that Cope has duly explained both sides of the pun, we have only to imagine a pause, or pauses (between the words), which would not be noted in the manuscript; so in the

calls "novelty" in style. This happens when the thing is a surprise, and, as he says, does not answer to our presentiment; like those words, formed by a change, which comic writers use. Jokes which depend on the change of a letter have this effect: they deceive.'

² Compare the more specific allusion in *Rhetoric* 3. 12. 1413b 25-6: οὐκ καὶ Φιλήμων ὁ ὑποκριτὴς ἐποίησεν τε τῇ Ἀναξανδρίδου Γεγοντομανίᾳ. Following Kock, *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta* 2. 138-9, I have changed the γ of both Cope and Roemer to a capital letter.

If the maidens referred to in the other passage (ὑπερήμεροι μοι τῶν γάμων αἱ παρθένοι) were conceivably the daughters of Danaus, the μοι might indicate, not their father, but the Herald of King Aegyptus, as the speaker: 'The marriage-bonds of the (?young) ladies, I think, have passed their date.' The theme of the *Suppliant Maidens*, treated by Aeschylus, became the subject of a comedy *Δαναίδες* by Aristophanes, as also of a comedy with the same title by Diphilus; see Kock 1.454; 2.548. Anaxandrides is said to have composed 65 comedies; if so, the titles of 25 are unknown; of these 25, a number must have dealt with mythological subjects (see Croiset, *Hist. Litt. grecque* 3. 606).

joke preceding this one: 'And as he stepped along, beneath his feet were—chilblains' (where the listener expects 'sandals'). In a modern book the joke as Cope understands it would be represented with the help of spaces and a dash: *Thratt ei—se*. As it happens, in the very next illustration after this—another word-play effected by a turn or twist in the pronunciation of a letter or two, Aristotle gives the form of words but once: καὶ τὸ 'βούλει αὐτὸν πέρσαι'³; he trusts his reader to think of the two pronunciations at once—whatever they were, for, as Cope intimates, 'No satisfactory explanation has been given of this pun.'

However, Cope proceeds to solve it as hinging on the termination of βούλει (= βουλῇ); and this suggests that the turn of the pun we are examining may likewise be found in the termination of θραττεισε (to place the letters as they would appear in an early manuscript). The possibilities seem to be θραττ-ει-σε; θραττει-σε; θραττεις-ε. Assuming with Cope, Cobet, and Susemihl the possibility of a scribal error of some sort, and admitting the correctness of Cope's interpretation of Idea No. 2, θραττ' εἰ ('You are a Thracian maid-servant'), can we find any other interpretation for Idea No. 1 than θράττει σε ('It confounds you'—'You are confounded')? Is θράττεις, or perhaps *θραττεις, a possibility?

In a tentative answer to this question, let us begin with the description of Nikon, whom Aristotle calls τὸν κιθαρωδόν, 'the harper,' 'him of the cithara.' One might be tempted to connect him with the comic poet Nikon, author of a play called *Κιθαρωδός* (cited by Athenaeus and Pollux); save that Meineke in a casual allusion to the subject of the joke (*Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* 3.575) makes no reference to the poet, and that Kock (*Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*), following Meineke, includes the poet among the later writers of the New Comedy. May we not, however, associate Nikon the harper

³ This also seems to come to Aristotle through Theodorus the rhetorician, the καὶ τὸ being correlative with the αὐτὸν τὸ (θεοδώρου).

Theodorus the actor is likewise mentioned by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* (3. 2. 4); according to Plutarch (*De se laud.* 545 f.), he once told the comic actor Satyrus that it was easy enough to make an audience laugh, but to make them weep was the difficulty (I borrow the language of Haigh, *Attic Theatre*, 1907, p. 283). But in the present case, having cited the rhetorician, Aristotle would hardly turn to the actor without a specific identification.

with the stage in some capacity? At all events there should be a reason for the epithet applied to him by Aristotle, who commonly wastes no words—least of all in citations.

That Nikon may have been the subject of a witticism in the work of a comic poet or the like has already been suggested. I have lately gone through the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle marking the evidence hitherto noted by scholars, and collecting additional evidence, of the historical relation between rhetorical theory and the art of comedy—that relation which, as Rutherford shows (in *A Chapter in the History of Annotation*), becomes so pervasive in the scholiasts on Aristophanes. At this point in the text my eye was caught by the collocation of the words *κιθαρωδόν* and *θράττει*, which sent me to Meineke and Kock, and to the *Plutus* and the *Frogs* of Aristophanes. Including the Nikon mentioned by Athenaeus and Pollux, Kock lists no fewer than nine comic poets,⁴ to each of whom is attributed a play entitled *Κιθαρωδός*; in addition he lists a *Κιθαριστής* of Antiphanes, possibly identical with the *Κιθαρωδός* of the same poet, a *Κιθαριστής* of Menander, and a *Κιθαρίστρια* of Anaxandrides (not to mention an *Ὀρφεύς* of Antiphanes). The fortunes of the harper and his instrument evidently were a stock theme in the Middle and New Comedy. It may be added that Anaxandrides has been accounted a favorite author with Aristotle; and that we may place the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle in the time of the Middle Comedy. But since Aristotle knew the *Rhetoric* of Theodorus (it was likewise known to Plato⁵) in an earlier as well as a later edition, the chances favor a belief that the joke on Nikon recorded by Theodorus, if derived from the comic stage, harks back to the days of the Old Comedy and of scurrilous gibes at particular individuals. Thus in the *Clouds* 970 ff. Aristophanes pays his respects to the *κιθαρωδός* Phrynīs, and the ‘curst and crooked trills and roulades’ of his school (Starkie’s translation).

Of course the cithara (= harp or lyre) was itself constantly

⁴ Alexis, Anaxippus, Antiphanes, Apollodorus, Clearchus, Diphilus, Nikon, Sophilus, Theophilus. As for the Flute-player, male or female, Anaxilas, Antiphanes, and Philemon each composed an *Αὐλητής*; Phoenicides an *Αὐλητρίδης*; Diodorus, Antiphanes, and Menander each an *Αὐλητρίς*. The earliest play of the sort was Magnes’ *Βαρβιτιστάλ*.

⁵ See, for example, *Phaedrus* 266e.

employed in the performances of the Old Comedy. In the *Birds* of Aristophanes, says Haigh (*Attic Theatre*, 1907, p. 271), 'it is clear that the flute-player and the four harpists were disguised as birds, and wore masks of an appropriate kind.' Moreover, Aristophanes parodies the sound of the cithara in verbal form—which brings us to the heart of the present article, a consideration of the stem *θρατ(το)* or *θρετ(τα)* used in imitation of a man thrumming upon a stringed instrument.

In the *Plutus* 290, 296, Aristophanes twice employs the expression *θρεττανελὸ τὸν Κύκλωπα*. The scholiast tells us that the word *θρεττανελό* comes from Philoxenus—that is, from his dithyrambic pastoral poem on the loves of the Cyclops and Galatea; Aristotle (*Poetics*, chap. 7) gives us to understand that the work had the main characteristic of comedy. The word is thought to have been invented by Philoxenus to represent the wretched music of Polyphemus as he wooed the nymph with a twangling cithara, or with his voice in imitation of a cithara. A similar vocable, *θραττο*, is employed by Aristophanes in *Frogs* (Rogers' numbering) 1286, 88, 90, 92, 94, where Euripides is made to ridicule the rhythm and music of the Aeschylean choruses, and where *τὸ φλαττοθραττοφλαττόθρατ*, the entire expression occurring five times at brief intervals, is again imitative of a musician thrumming on a cithara or harp.

Although no instance of a verb like *θράττειν* with the meaning 'to thrum' or the like has come down to us (so far as I can discover) unless in the passage quoted from the *Rhetoric* (and possibly in the lines hereafter quoted from Mnesimachus), is there any reason why we should not suppose the word to have existed, at least in colloquial usage? * If we admit the possibility of such a verb in the joke on Nikon the harper, a far better pun emerges. Though I must ultimately leave the details of emendation to an expert in Greek textual criticism, let us suppose for the moment that we delete the final *ε*; we then have: *θράττεις*. Now let us read as the conditions of this kind of pleasantry demand. The listener knows Nikon to be a harper (and from Thrace); he expects *θράττεις*. But you pause before

* In order to explain *βοῦλει αὐτὸν πέρσαι*, Majoragijs, as noted by Cope, supposes that there was a verb *πέρσειν*, not elsewhere recorded. Cope rejects the hypothesis; but *θράττειν* would not be open to the same objections.

uttering the sigma: Θράττ' εἰ -ς. 'You are a scullion from Thrace'; 'You thrum the harp.' The deletion of the final ε is a less violent textual change than that of Susemihl, less even than that of Cope. More conservative yet would be the substitution of υ for the terminal ε: Θράττ' εἰ σύ = θράττευσ σύ. Meanwhile for those who cling to the traditional reading θράττει σε, a triple pun is among the possibilities: You thrum; you are a Thracian quean—you are stunned!

For my part, if it is possible, I prefer the *mot à double entente*. It is as if a bad comic poet who had been reading the good Mr. Barrie were to catch the poet Swinburne with his lyre, and to exclaim: 'Our Lady of Thrums!'

* * * *

I subjoin a few additional gleanings; and first, in order to be fair and open, the chief objection I have discovered to my interpretation of Idea No. 1, this objection being connected with the interpretation of a partly doubtful passage in a fragment from the Ἰπποτρόφος of Mnesimachus (Kock 2. 437-8, Frg. 4; cf. Meineke 3. 568-75). This fragment, preserved by Athenaeus (9.402 f), contains an overdrawn description of a banquet, with the preparations and activities of the household; the items of the list are arranged by fours or by pairs. Lines 56-7 read:

σεμναὶ δ' αὐλῶν ἀγαναὶ φωναί,
μολπά, κλαγγά, θράττει, πνεῖται.

I follow Kock as well as Meineke in rejecting a third verb νεῖται between θράττει and πνεῖται, but place a comma after μολπά, and another after κλαγγά. Meineke (3.574-5) comments: 'θράττει de turbulento mesicorum [*sic*] instrumentorum strepitu dictum. Cfr. Marinus in vita Proculi cap. 33: θράττεσθαι τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐκ τῶν θρήνων. Pertinet huc Theodori iocus de Nicone citharoedo, θράττει σε apud Aristot. Rhet. 3.11, quod ambigue dictum, *obtundit aures tuas*, et *Thressa cecinit* (Θράττ' ἦσε). Id enim voluisse suspicor Theodorum. Niconem Thracem fuisse annotavit Aris-toteles. Quod sequitur νεῖται, apud Atticos constanter futuri habet significatum, nec dicitur nisi de rebus animatis. Itaque seclusi, utpote ex dittographia ortum sequentis πνεῖται, quod de tibiae flatu intellegendum.'

Perhaps Meineke would have rendered his position firmer by

quoting from the *Vita Procli* of Marinus more exactly: ὡς μηκέτι θράττεσθαι τὴν ἀκοὴν ἐκ τῶν ἀπεμφαινόντων θρήνων; yet it seems like a far cry from a point of usage in Aristotle and in a poet of the Middle Comedy to an illustration from Byzantine usage of the fifth century A. D. in Marinus' biography of the Neo-Platonic philosopher. But, admitting a measure of justice in the illustration; even so, we may feel that the familiar verb θράττειν (= θράσσειν) might associate itself through onomatopoeia with the sound of rhythmical music, as of the harp, and in this association might take on so much of special color as to become virtually a separate word.⁷ If so, then in the passage from Mnesimachus we should read κλαγγά, the shrill sound of the flute, with πνέται, as indeed Meineke suggests, and μολπά, a song accompanied by some other kind of measured movement, with θράττει, this verb being here used intransitively. In fact, my view of the word derives support from the translation of Athenaeus by Yonge (2.636), who renders the lines:

And lovely sounds from tuneful flutes,
And song and din go through the house,
Of instruments both wind and stringed.

The word θράττει does not occur in the extant portions of Aristophanes. Of the other two occurrences of the form in the comic poets, one has experienced a fortuitous association with the comedy entitled *Θράτται* of Cratinus (see Meineke 2. 227). Is it mere chance that has brought the other into a passage from the *Δουλοδιδάσκαλος* of Pherecrates (Kock 1.155, Frg. 39) where a play has been found on κίθαρος, a fish, and the κιθάρα?—

A. κίθαρος γεγενῆσθαι κάγοράζειν κίθαρος ὦν.

B. ἀγαθόν γ' ὃ κίθαρος καὶ πρὸς Ἀπόλλωνος πάνν.

A. ἐκεῖνο θράττει μ', ὅτι λέγουσιν, ὦ γαθή,

ἔνεστιν ἐν κιθάρῳ τι κακόν.

Or (if we may now indulge in almost pure guesswork) is there a word-play on the fish κίθαρος and the fish θράττα? What then of the odd passage from the *Ἰχθύες* of Archippus (Kock 1.684, Frg. 27)?—

ἀποδοῦναι δ' ὅσα ἔχομεν ἀλλήλων, ἡμᾶς μὲν τὰς Θράττας καὶ τὴν

⁷ In the quotation from Marinus, θράττεσθαι alliterates with θρήνων.

Ἀθερίνην αὐλητρίδα καὶ Σηπίαν τὴν Θύρσου καὶ τοὺς Τριγλίαι καὶ
 Εὐκλείδην τὸν ἄρξαντα καὶ Ἀναγυροντιόθεν τοὺς Κορακίωνας καὶ
 Κωβιοῦ τοῦ Σαλαμίνιου τόκον καὶ Βάτραχον τὸν πάρεδρον τὸν ἐξ
 Ὠρεοῦ.

Here we have an indubitable pun on *θράττας* the fish and *Θράττας* the ladies of foreign extraction whose sons have an uncertain claim to Athenian citizenship. *Sepia*, the cuttle-fish, has the name of a courtesan. *Atherine* the flute-player is likewise a strange fish (see *Athenaeus* 7.285a; 300f)—a woman of the same general description. Is there any reason why the *αὐλητρίς* or flute-girl should be mentioned immediately after the *Θράτται*? Are these 'strange women' not only fish but harpers as well? The entire passage is full of puns and allusions, not all of them explained, not all of them savory; further study of it may throw light on one or two references to *Θράττα* in *Aristophanes*—for example, *Acharnians* 271-5.

Finally, is it conceivable that in the joke upon *Nicon* the *κιθαρωδός* the word *θράττει* contains a play upon the word *θράττα* the fish? Besides meaning a harper, *κιθαρωδός* at times has the same, or approximately the same signification as *κίθαρος* (=turbot).—But doubtless I should not seek too many reasons for disbelieving my earlier interpretation of the pleasantry.

LANE COOPER.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

IV.—TACITUS AND TIBERIUS.

Among the many problems which for long have interested students of Tacitus' *Annals* not the least important has been the character of Tiberius. Undoubtedly Tacitus has presented an extremely unfavorable portrait of that emperor—a portrait, in the opinion of most scholars in recent years, not true to life. The opinion was formed through a more complete understanding of Tiberius' able rule of the Roman Empire. An immediate consequence of it has been very serious criticism of Tacitus' credibility. Critics have questioned his honesty of purpose, and have declared that the Tiberius of the *Annals* is a creation of Tacitus' own imagination. They have hardly stopped to consider the possibility of the existence, in the literature of the first century, of an opinion unfavorable to Tiberius, which Tacitus could have adopted. It is the purpose of this paper to demonstrate that an unfavorable opinion, whether a correct one or not, existed, and to show, by pointing to significant details of it, that Tacitus, though he made use of it, clearly did not create it.

Since 1900 there have appeared several studies, accessible in English, which in one way or another touch on the problem. Tarver, in his "Tiberius the Tyrant," has it that "Tacitus is a bitter pamphleteer of consummate ability; his affectation of impartiality is a well-considered pose, whose insincerity becomes manifest. . . . Tacitus was interested in proving that till the reigns of Nerva and Trajan there never had been a good emperor." With this point of view—I might almost say, starting with these premises—Tarver proceeds to clear Tiberius from most charges, incidentally finding it necessary to attack the character of the emperor's mother, Livia. In 1906 Boissier, in his interesting "Tacitus," put forward very sanely the proposition that Tacitus was following his sources in his characterization of Tiberius. His view has not won complete approval, possibly because he does not go to extremes in clearing the character of Tiberius.

A few years later Ferrero¹ in "Julia and Tiberius" endeavored

¹ *Characters and Events of Roman History*, 1909.

"to prove that the Tiberius of Tacitus and Suetonius is a fantastic personality. . . . invented by party hatred." He would have Tiberius "a living anachronism," a strict and stern moralist of somewhat the type of old Cato. He does not however particularly blame Tacitus for the misrepresentation of the righteous emperor. In 1912 "The Tacitean Tiberius," a study by T. S. Jerome, appeared.² So far as I know this is the latest study of the subject. It contends, to quote a review,³ "that the real explanation of the inconsistency between Tacitus' sweeping assertions on Tiberius and the facts as he records them is not that he had a bias against him, nor followed an established tradition, but that the *Annals* are written according to the rhetorician's method." Certainly Jerome has done a service in showing that Tacitus' comment is often somewhat at variance with the evidence he gives, usually in the direction of blackening Tiberius' character. But in doing this Jerome apparently takes from Tacitus all honest intent to give a true account.⁴

Any historical writing must in the very nature of things be colored by the character, the temperament, the prejudices, the purposes of the writer, no matter how impartial he may attempt to be. Tacitus attempted to write, or so he tells us, "*sine ira ac studio quorum causas procul habeo.*" But we know that he was

² *Classical Philology* (July, 1912), pp. 265-292.

³ *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (1912), p. 112.

⁴ See pages 269, 276, 289. Jerome seems to be guilty of several errors of more or less importance to his theory. On p. 268 he says: "The contemporary evidence as to Tiberius is uniformly favorable." Of course nothing really hostile could be published during a reign; but the hostile evidence of Seneca (see below) is that of a contemporary. P. 283: "There is no hint of it (the eleven years' orgy on Capri) in any writer prior to Tacitus." This argument has little force since no historical work on the last years of Tiberius exists prior to Tacitus. But Suetonius independently of Tacitus gives material enough, as will be shown. P. 285: Jerome gives no adequate reason for referring the origin of the stories of Capri to the time of Tiberius' retirement to Rhodes, or for referring the poems quoted by Suetonius (Tiberius 69) to that period. P. 288: "The speech purports to be delivered in the emperor's presence, but he was not at Rome during this time." This is no error of Tacitus. An emperor was often present by a legal fiction. See Furneaux, *Annals* XVI 22, 2 and note; and III 57, 1 and note. On page 267 Jerome, oddly enough, seems to think that Tacitus actually quotes the speeches of Tiberius verbatim.

a member of the senatorial nobility, hating oppression of the senate while he recognized the necessity of the imperial form of government. We know that he was by nature pessimistic, for we find gloom and pessimism in all his historical works. We know finally the purpose of his writing, a pragmatic purpose, "*ne virtutes sileantur, utque pravis dictis factisque ex posteritate et infamia metus sit.*"⁵ It is then natural that all these elements exist in Tacitus' picture of Tiberius.⁶ We shall see if they wholly make up that picture.

But Tacitus is accused of absolutely wilful disregard of the truth. In determining the truth of the charge only an examination of Tacitus' relation to his sources will be satisfactory; but an introductory statement on the conception of the value of truthfulness in historical composition entertained by the circle of Tacitus' friends, and apparently by Tacitus, will assist us in getting a correct point of view. The letters of the younger Pliny are our source.

Jerome would prove that the ancient historians, Tacitus in particular, held that the writing of history and the composition of speeches for the law courts could be treated by the same methods, and that even the disregard of the truth in making a telling point in a speech was justifiable in historical narration. This is hardly so. There was an idea that a good orator ought to make a good historian; but simply because of the orator's command of narrative style and expression. In the two kinds of composition it was recognized that there were great differences. Pliny felt this very strongly. He writes in one letter that such different treatment was necessary, that he could not consider preparing speeches for publication and writing history at the same time. In this letter he is not considering the question of truthfulness in historical composition.

But this subject he does take up elsewhere. In one letter⁷ he relates a conversation which he himself had heard. Cluvius

⁵ *Annals*, III 65.

⁶ I doubt that Tacitus' hatred of Domitian caused him to hate Tiberius, as is sometimes stated. The composition of the *Annals* only began some ten years after Domitian's death. It is of course quite possible that Tacitus may have been influenced in his understanding of Tiberius' reign by his knowledge of Domitian's reign of terror.

⁷ IX 19, 5.

Rufus, the historian, speaks to the old warrior Verginius: "You know, Verginius, what truthfulness is due to history: so if you read anything in my history which differs from what you might like, I ask you to pardon me." The quotation needs no comment. Pliny begins the well-known letter⁸ on the eruption of Vesuvius, with these words, addressed to Tacitus himself: "You request me to describe for you the circumstances attending the death of my uncle, so that you can with greater accuracy (*verius*) relate them for posterity." We are told in so many words that Tacitus wanted to give an accurate account. There is one other letter⁹ that has information to the point. Pliny writes directly and unabashedly to Tacitus requesting him to include an action of his in the history which he is composing. Pliny makes his plea in these words: "that you may believe it would be a great pleasure to me if you would honor my action by your genius and your testimony." After relating the occurrence he concludes: "These matters you will make better known, more honorable, greater: and yet I do not ask you to go beyond the limits of the actual facts. For history should not exceed the truth, and for honorable deeds the truth is enough."¹⁰ It seems clear enough then that for Pliny, Tacitus, and their circle, truth-telling was an essential in historical narration. And yet what does Pliny mean by the confident assertion that Tacitus "will make (his deeds) better known, more honorable, greater"? He means in part that their very inclusion in Tacitus' work will give them glory; but he means further that Tacitus will favorably emphasize them, without being untruthful. Tacitus is to take the photograph and touch it up; or he is to add his own colors to a clearly outlined drawing. This he doubtless did in all his historical work; but did he intentionally carry it so far in the case of Tiberius that the original could not recognize his own likeness?

We must now turn to the works which mention Tiberius—most of them written before the time of Tacitus. Strabo, in his geography which was finished during the first years of Tiberius, calls attention favorably to the assistance given Sardis and other

⁸ VI 16.

⁹ VII 33.

¹⁰ The letter of Cicero to Luceius (*Ad Familiares*, V 12) is often compared. Cicero, however, asks outright that his friend transgress the laws of history in his favor.

cities after a dreadful earthquake.¹¹ The brief Roman History of Velleius Paterculus, published in 30 A. D., is highly eulogistic, but gives so little detail that we can hardly draw information from it. A favorable opinion may mean nothing in the case of a book published in Rome, and dealing with the life of the ruling emperor. The book does not include the last years of Tiberius, which are regularly represented as the worst. Valerius Maximus, whose work was produced about 31 A. D., also lauds the emperor. To him Tiberius is "salutaris princeps," a splendid ruler and punisher of crime.¹² Philo says of Tiberius "that he was grave and sincere and only cared for serious things."¹³ We find no other references favorable to Tiberius in the works of his contemporaries.

In the works of the philosopher Seneca there are scattered references to Tiberius of great importance. In the *De Beneficiis*,¹⁴ written about 25 years after Tiberius' death, there is a paragraph so significant that it deserves full quotation: "Under Tiberius Cæsar there was a repeated and almost nation-wide madness in bringing accusations, which bore more heavily upon the peaceful citizens than any civil war. The talk of drunken men was caught up (for the purpose of bringing accusation against them), the innocent intentions of men telling a joke. There was no safety; every occasion for practising cruelty was used. And no more was the news of the outcome of the trial of the accused awaited since it was always one and the same." In the *Consolatio ad Marciam*,¹⁵ written less than fifteen years after Tiberius, Seneca states: "Recall that time most bitter to you when Sejanus gave the life of your father as a kind of present to his client." And again he quotes Marcia's father as declaring that the only escape from the slavery of being among the satellites of Sejanus was death. He declares that Cordus was a true

¹¹ XIII 4, 8 (p. 627); cf. XII 8, 18 (p. 579). Tacitus also gives Tiberius credit for helping the cities: *Annals*, II 47.

¹² I preface; VIII 13. For this reference and that to Strabo I am indebted to Andriessen, *De fide et auctoritate etc.*, Hagae, 1883.

¹³ See Boissier, *Tacitus*, English edition, p. 101. I have not had access to Philo's works directly. [Philo's judgment of Tiberius, so far as it goes, is favorable enough: *Leg. ad Gaium*, §§ 8 ff., 119, 141 f., 159 ff., 167, 298 ff. But Philo is contrasting Caligula's persecution of the Jews with Tiberius' treatment of them.—C. W. E. M.]

¹⁴ III 26.

¹⁵ XXII 4; I 2.

Roman in character and action when the necks of all were bowed beneath the yoke of Sejanus. Cordus will be remembered; "but the crimes of those butchers, by which alone they gained a record, will soon be forgotten."¹⁶ Finally in an epigram he describes the period as one "quo magna pietas erat, nihil impie facere."¹⁷ These few statements give a picture of terrible cruelty that is not surpassed in the *Annals*. On the basis of these statements alone it can be confidently asserted that Tacitus did not invent the cruel Tiberius.

Seneca offers still more evidence. He relates an incident of an old friend coming to Tiberius when emperor, and desiring to talk over old times.¹⁸ Tiberius "treated his old friend as a busy-body," says Seneca, and the philosopher concludes with the sweeping statement: "He rejected the acquaintance of all friends and companions." It will not be possible to find Tacitus going so far in picturing the aloofness of Tiberius. Tiberius had, when requested, helped an ex-praetor pay his debts; but, in the opinion of Seneca, had done it in such a rude way, "with the addition of insulting advice," that the man could not be expected to feel grateful.¹⁹ Seneca, like Tacitus, gives us a picture of the stoical self-control of Tiberius in public: "Tiberius delivered the funeral oration before the rostrum on the death of his own son, and stood in the public view . . . and though the Roman people wept, he held his features unmoved."²⁰ In the flattering introduction of the *De Clementia*,²¹ addressed to Nero about 56 A. D., we read: "But you have placed a heavy burden upon yourself. No one any longer speaks of the Divine Augustus, nor of the early periods of Tiberius Caesar: no one will seek beyond you for a model because he wishes to imitate you." Here is at least a distinct suggestion of the division of Tiberius' reign into periods, which we find so elaborately worked out in Tacitus. We have Seneca's Tiberius, an unfeeling, unfriendly, cruel ruler, particularly so in the latter part of his reign. We have, too, the bloodthirsty Sejanus. The impressions which Seneca give us are in all probability not those formed by his own reading, but

¹⁶ *Op. cit.* I 3-4.

¹⁸ *De Beneficiis*, V 25, 2.

²⁰ *Consolatio ad Marciam*, XV 2.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.* I 2.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.* II 7.

²¹ I 1.

by his own experiences and associations. He was probably about forty years old at the death of Tiberius, and belonged to the circles of the equestrian and senatorial nobility. It is almost certain that he gives us the view of Tiberius that prevailed in those circles.

Pliny, the Elder, comments in his *Natural History* on the character of Tiberius: "*tristissimum, ut constat, hominum.*"²² It was generally established in Pliny's time, it will be noted, that Tiberius was very morose.²³ The same characteristic was later applied by Tacitus, and at least once by the use of a word from the same root.²⁴

In what Josephus has to relate about Tiberius we get for the first time information based undoubtedly on earlier literary sources, and not on personal knowledge. In the *Jewish Antiquities*, published about 94 A. D., he emphasizes the extravagant rejoicing at Rome on the death of Tiberius: "For this Tiberius had brought dreadful misery on the best families of the Romans . . . he had indulged in hatred against men, without reason, for he was by nature fierce . . . and made death the penalty for the slightest offenses."²⁵ In the same chapter Josephus illustrates Tiberius' great interest in astrology, which is also emphasized in Tacitus.²⁶ In another section Tiberius is represented as "dilatatory, if ever a king or tyrant was so." He delayed in receiving ambassadors; he kept men in prison for long periods without trial, "that by being troubled with present calamity (the guilty) may undergo greater misery"; he seldom appointed new governors.²⁷ This is a characteristic also to be found in Tacitus.²⁸ In the same chapter Josephus gives a sketch of Germanicus: his character was generally excellent; he was quite affable; he was esteemed by the senate, the people, and by all nations subject to Rome; there was genuine sorrow at his death.²⁹ Here is a Germanicus ready to hand as a foil for the

²² XXVIII 23. Cf. XXXV 28: "Tiberius Caesar, minime comis imperator."

²³ Cf. Pliny, *Letters*, I 10, 7, for a similar use of the term.

²⁴ *Annals*, I 76.

²⁵ *Ant.* XVIII 6, 10.

²⁶ *Annals*, VI 21. Tacitus and Josephus both have Tiberius' prophecy of Galba's reign, though in slightly different form.

²⁷ *Ant.* XVIII 6, 5.

²⁸ E. g. *Annals*, I 80.

²⁹ *Ant.* XVIII 6, 8.

tyrant emperor. There is no excuse for accusing Tacitus of heightening the contrast.

Suetonius' *Tiberius* is the earliest work, excluding the *Annals*, which aims to present a complete study of Tiberius. Curiously enough in the main and in detail the same sort of a Tiberius is described. Of course it may be argued that Suetonius, writing a little later than Tacitus, had the work of Tacitus before him. This is probably true; but it is also true that Suetonius, completing his work so soon after that of Tacitus, could not have thought of following only this new history to the exclusion of all earlier works. And it is also true that in many of the details, in many of the illustrations and incidents, Suetonius was clearly independent of Tacitus. This is to be expected from the well-known scissors and paste method of Suetonius in collecting and arranging material.

The evidence of Suetonius about the cruelty of Tiberius is not necessary, after what has already been given, to prove that Tacitus did not invent the characteristic. It is, however, of the greatest importance that in connection with some of the alleged instances there is given an unfavorable interpretation of the act or remark of the emperor, just in the manner of Tacitus. A remarkable instance is the following: "But when he learned that vows had been made also for the safety (of the young Nero and Drusus) he declared in the senate that such honors ought not to be given except to men of age and experience. And by that statement, disclosing the secret thought of his heart, he exposed them to accusation . . . and (finally) put them to death."³⁰ What we have here is a wrong interpretation of a perfectly reasonable remark of the emperor. Suetonius no doubt found the statement in his source. Tacitus, giving the same incident, does not give the unfavorable interpretation: "Tiberius, at no time kind to the house of Germanicus, at this time was quite impatient that the young men were put on a par with him in his old age . . . in a speech in the senate he advised that for the future no one should stimulate to haughtiness the impressionable minds of young men by premature honors."³¹ Another instance is found in Suetonius, but not in Tacitus: "An ex-consul has written in his annals that, at a

³⁰ *Tiberius*, 54.

³¹ *Annals*, IV 17.

well-attended banquet at which he was himself present, he (Tiberius) was asked . . . why Paconius accused of treason lived so long . . . a few days later he wrote to the senate to decide on the punishment of Paconius as soon as possible."³² The incident is given in a section of the life which deals with Tiberius' cruelty. It shows that there was at least one writer of history, a contemporary of Tiberius, who would not hesitate to use insufficient evidence to prove Tiberius cruel. Other illustrations are to be had;³³ but here is enough to indicate that Tacitus did not need to invent, for he could find in earlier historians, not only direct accusations of cruelty, but wrong interpretations of acts possibly quite innocent.

Tacitus represents Tiberius as a hypocrite, a man who continually hid his real thoughts, while pretending to think something quite different. He represents Tiberius as practising greater and greater cruelty and indulging in vice more and more as the restraining influence of various persons was removed by death. With this conception, at the end of book VI he has divided the reign of Tiberius into five sections, each succeeding section worse than the one before it. This plan, Tacitean though it seems, is not original with Tacitus. Suetonius also speaks of "vices long concealed with difficulty,"³⁴ of the "crafty hesitation and ambiguous replies"³⁵ of Tiberius. He alone represents Tiberius at the beginning of his reign feigning poor health so that Germanicus, his natural successor, would not revolt, but await his early death.³⁶ "(His cruel nature) was evident even at the beginning of his rule when he still was trying to gain the good will of men by a pretence of moderation."³⁷ Suetonius also contains evidence of a dividing of Tiberius' reign into clearly marked periods. There are four of them: one to the death of Germanicus; the second to the retirement to Capri; the third to the death of Sejanus; the fourth to Tiberius' death.³⁸ The fact that Suetonius' arrangement agrees only in part with that of Tacitus proves his inde-

³² Tiberius, 61, 6.

³³ Op. cit. 57, 2; 61, 5; both independent of Tacitus.

³⁴ Op. cit. 42, 1.

³⁵ Op. cit. 24, 1.

³⁶ Op. cit. 25, 3.

³⁷ Op. cit. 57, 1.

³⁸ See Caligula 6, 2; Tiberius 42, 1; 61, 1; 62, 1. Dio Cassius, LVII 19, also ends a first period at the death of Germanicus.

pendence. There is an exact agreement in the conception of progressive degeneration as restraints were removed. For example Tacitus asserts: "(Tiberius was) secretive and crafty with a pretence of virtue as long as Germanicus and Drusus were alive."³⁹ The corresponding remark in Suetonius is: "The awfulness of the following periods increased the reputation (of Germanicus) and the longing for him after his death, a time when everyone, not without reason, thought that Tiberius' cruel character had been restrained by respect for Germanicus and by fear of him, though it soon after broke through all restraint." Suetonius also gives full weight to the charges of sensuality. In fact, short as the biography is, he gives more space to them than does Tacitus in the *Annals*. And he is independent of Tacitus in much, perhaps all, of it.⁴⁰

Suetonius devotes one section of the biography to the good conduct of Tiberius, in the early part of his reign.⁴¹ Dio Cassius has a similar section not dependent on Suetonius, but very possibly from a common source.⁴² Dio confines this good conduct to the first period, which ended with the death of Germanicus. He concludes his account with the significant explanation that Tiberius was either naturally good at first and only later degenerated, or that he was shamming from the beginning.⁴³ Suetonius tacitly agrees with this indefinite explanation. Tacitus, as we know, takes the position that Tiberius from the very first was shamming, and he may have influenced Dio and Suetonius. But we remember that Seneca referred to the good beginning of Tiberius' reign. Apparently writers were at one in believing in a Tiberius who became more cruel and base as time went on, though he was good at the beginning; but they differed in explaining the good beginning.

³⁹ Suetonius and Tacitus both say that Tiberius did not express his thoughts clearly in his speeches. Tacitus, *Annals*, I 11, is inclined to attribute this habit generally to the duplicity of Tiberius. Suetonius, *Tiberius*, 70, 1, says that it was due to affectation and pedantry in his style.

⁴⁰ *Tiberius*, 42-45; *Annals*, VI 1.

⁴¹ *Tiberius*, 26-32.

⁴² LVII 7-13. Chapter 7 and Suetonius' chapter 26 begin very much alike.

⁴³ It has not seemed necessary to use other information from Dio. Suetonius is complete enough for our purpose.

Our study apparently indicates that Tacitus did not create the Tiberius whom he describes, and did not himself invent his various characteristics. Of course, with the character already clearly outlined for him, it is probably true that he did put his own interpretation on some of Tiberius' actions.⁴⁴ But this is a matter merely of details and could not change the conception of Tiberius already existing. How far Tacitus may have carried this practice can never be known unless the work of some historian of the first century is discovered. It should be noted in this connection that Tacitus sometimes expresses a view more favorable to Tiberius than does his source.⁴⁵

Tacitus may properly be accused of failing to see, or even of not wanting to see—perhaps for the sake of the unity of his conception of Tiberius—the discrepancies between acts and the interpretations put on them, and between proper, sane interpretation and exaggeration. This is a bad fault. But we may not censure Tacitus for not presenting a Tiberius such as that of Tarver. Tacitus, as he says himself⁴⁶ and as was the usual practice, followed the consensus of opinion among previous writers, however much he may have used primary sources and official documents. We have seen that that consensus was hostile to Tiberius.

It is not the purpose of the present study to determine how far the general view of Tiberius was a true one; but it may not be without interest to suggest that perhaps there was a reason for, or at least an excuse for, the unfavorable opinion. Suetonius speaks of Tiberius' stiff bearing, the set, hard look on his face, the fact that he talked but rarely even with his friends, and he tells us that Augustus apologized for these defects to the senate and the people. Augustus himself did not like the harshness of his character.⁴⁷ This evident reserve, this lack of affability, would certainly make him unpopular. Besides this he gave very few and simple public entertainments, as compared with Augustus, and almost no doles of money.⁴⁸ He did not attend public festivities regularly.⁴⁹ Such conduct would win small favor with the pleasure-loving populace of Rome. To

⁴⁴ See Fabia, *Les Sources de Tacite*, p. 446, section 2.

⁴⁵ *Annals*, I 76; IV 10.

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.* XIII 20.

⁴⁷ *Tiberius*, 68, 3-4; 21, 2; 51, 1.

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.* 46-48.

⁴⁹ *Annals*, I 76.

this we must add the effect on the people of the stay at Capri during the last eleven years of his reign. During that time he never returned to Rome and seldom was on the mainland. All sorts of rumors naturally arose to explain this most unusual course. One of the best-favored explanations was that Tiberius wanted to indulge without any restraint in a life of sensuality. Whether there was any basis for the rumor or not is uncertain. But the charge of cruelty has basis enough in the acts of the final period. Sejanus, the regent at Rome, was cruel, and after his overthrow Tiberius was, to put it mildly, severe.⁵⁰ It resulted naturally enough that acts of the last years of Tiberius fixed for ever his reputation for cruelty. On his death the senate did not deify him, although it had deified both Julius Caesar and Augustus. It annulled his will at the request of Caligula, "on the ground that . . . he had not been of sound mind," and at the beginning of the following year it failed to confirm his acts.⁵¹

G. A. HARRER.

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA.

⁵⁰ The prosecutions of Cremutius Cordus on account of opinions expressed in his history, and of Mamercus Scaurus for lines in a tragedy are certain. See the references to Seneca above; also Seneca, *Sua-soriae*, II 22, and *Praef. Controv. Lib. X* 5; *Annals*, VI 29.

⁵¹ Dio, *LIX* 1; *LIX* 9.

V.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHY.

PART I.

Pāli <i>ana-matagga</i>	} ‘having no conceivable beginning’
Prākṛit <i>ana-vayagga</i>	
Sanskrit <i>an-avarāgra</i>	‘having no starting-point in the past’

It is no exaggeration to say that *ana-matagga*, the stock epithet of the *saṃsāra*, is the most extraordinary and highly significant word in the Pāli language. Apparently, few scholars who have dealt with the word seem to have read what is perhaps the most remarkable chapter of the *Saṃyutta Nikāya*—the *Anamatagga Saṃyutta*; and the few who did read it failed to grasp the fundamental thought that runs through the chapter from the first word to the last,—the thought, namely, of the beginningless character of the round of existences. It is the purpose of this paper to settle, if possible, the etymology and meaning of this most remarkable word.

1. PREVIOUS ETYMOLOGIES OF *anamatagga*.

James D’Alwis (*Buddhist Nirvāṇa*, p. 21) divides the word *an* + *amata* + *agga*, ‘which does not end in *Nibbāna*.’ Childers (*Pāli Dictionary*, p. 31) accepts this explanation, but in his *Errata* (ib. p. 621) rejects it and confesses that he is at a loss to explain the composition and meaning of the word. Weber (*Indische Streifen*, vol. iii, p. 150) says: ‘*anamatagge saṃsāre möchte Ref. aus anāmatagge (āmṛita = mṛita) gekürzt ansehen: “ohne Ende und Anfang.”*’ Trenckner (*Pāli Miscellany*, p. 64) divides the word *an* + *a* + *mata* + *agga*, ‘whose end is not known.’ Jacobi (*Wörterbuch zu Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī*, p. 89) says of the Prākṛit form: ‘*aṇavayagga* (Pāli *anamatagga*, von $\sqrt{\text{nam}}$, “mit nicht gebogener Spitze, was immer gradaus läuft”), “endlos.”’ Pischel at first (*Bezenberger’s Beiträge*, iii. 1879, p. 245) was inclined to explain the word as had D’Alwis and Childers (see above), but afterwards changed his mind and adopted a modification of Jacobi’s theory. In his *Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen*,

§ 251, p. 175, he says: 'va ist für ma eingetreten in anavadagga anavayagga = Pāli anamatagga = anamadāgra zu √nam, die auch . . . va hat. . . . Die richtige Erklärung dieses terminus technicus, der ein Beiwort des saṃsāra ist, ist wohl "dessen Anfang sich nicht wegbeugt," = "sich nicht verändert" = "endlos." Die √nam hat richtig erkannt Jacobi, dessen sonstige Erklärung aber falsch ist. Die Scholiasten erklären das Wort mit ananta, aparyanta, aparyavasāna, und fassen meist avadagga avayagga als Deçiwort im Sinne von "Ende," zerlegen also das Wort in an + avadagga.' [For glosses on agga by Buddhaghosa, whose opinion on such matters is worth more than those of ordinary scholiasts, see the next paragraph.] Anderson (Glossary to Pāli Reader, p. 9) comments at some length on previous etymologies of the word and finally accepts the interpretation offered by Jacobi and Pischel: 'endless.' Recent translators, as for example Winternitz in A. Bertholet's Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch, pp. 223 f., adopt a tour de force and render the word *without beginning and end, or endless*.

2. THE TRUE ETYMOLOGY AND MEANING OF *anamatagga*.

The proper division of the word, in my opinion, is an-a- + mata + agga. The first element is the reinforced, emphatic negative prefix an-a-, 'not.' For an exhaustive treatment of this prefix, see my paper on The Compound Negative Prefix an-a- in Greek and Indic, American Journal of Philology, XXXIX, pp. 299 ff. The second element is the past passive participle (it might better be called a gerundive) of the root man, 'think,' ma-ta, 'thinkable,' 'knowable,' 'conceivable.' The suffix -ta of ma-ta here very clearly conveys the idea of possibility, as is often the case with this suffix in Indo-Germanic. See Brugmann's Comparative Grammar of the Indo-Germanic Languages, vol. ii, § 79, p. 220; Vergleichende Grammatik, II. 1², § 298, p. 401, § 300, pp. 402 ff.; Griechische Grammatik³, § 216, 1 a, pp. 200 f. The third element is the noun agga (Sanskrit agra), 'beginning.' It cannot be stated too emphatically that agga means 'beginning'; that it does not and cannot possibly mean 'end.' See Böhtlingk-Roth, sub voce agra. Buddhaghosa, at the beginning of his comment on the Etadagga Vagga of the Aṅguttara Nikāya (see Aṅguttara Commentary, Colombo, Ceylon, 1904, p. 76), glosses agga as meaning ādi =

'beginning,' koṭi = 'starting-point,' seṭṭha = 'foremost.' Significantly enough, he never adduces anta or pariyosāna, 'end.'

The word anamatagga means: *having no known, knowable, thinkable, conceivable beginning; whose beginning cannot possibly be known or imagined; whose beginning is beyond the power of thought to conceive.*

That the etymology proposed is correct, and that the word must therefore mean, not *without beginning or end* or *endless*, but *having no conceivable beginning*, is clear, first from the discussion of the saṃsāra in its aspect as anamatagga in the Anamatagga Saṃyutta, and secondly from the context of the word in many passages in the Legends of the Saints.

3. SYNOPSIS OF THE ANAMATAGGA SAṂYUTTA.

In the Anamatagga Saṃyutta (Saṃyutta Nikāya, xv: vol. ii, pp. 178-193) the Buddha is represented as addressing the monks as follows:

"Without conceivable beginning is this Round of Existences. Unknown is a starting-point in the past of beings impeded by the Impediment of Ignorance, fettered by the Fetter of Craving, hasting, hurrying, from birth to birth.¹ The ancestors of a man are more numerous than all the blades of grass and sticks and branches and leaves in India; more numerous than all the particles of dust that compose the earth. The tears shed, the mother's milk drunk by a man in his previous states of existence, are more abundant than all the water contained in the four great oceans.

"How long is a cycle of time?—Longer than would be required for a range of mountains a league in length, a league in breadth, a league in height, of solid rock, without a cleft, without a crack, to waste and wear away, were it to be wiped once in a century with a silken cloth; longer than would be required for a heap of mustard-seed of the same dimensions to disappear, were but a single seed to be removed once in a century. Of

¹ Anamataggo 'yaṃ bhikkhave saṃsāro, pubbā koṭi na paññāyati avijjānivarāṇānaṃ sattānaṃ taṇhāsamojjanānaṃ sandhāvataṃ saṃsārataṃ. Similar is the Buddhistic Sanskrit version (Divyāvadāna, 197¹⁵⁻¹⁸): Anavarāgro bhikṣavaḥ saṃsāro 'vidyānivarāṇānaṃ sattvānaṃ tṛṣṇāsaṃyojanānaṃ tṛṣṇārgalabaddhānaṃ dīrgham adhvānaṃ saṃdhāvataṃ saṃsāratāṃ pūrvā koṭir na prajñāyate duḥkhasya.

cycles of time as long as this, there have elapsed many hundreds of cycles, many thousands of cycles, many hundreds of thousands of cycles. Indeed, it is impossible to count them in terms of cycles or hundreds of cycles or thousands of cycles or hundreds of thousands of cycles. For example, were each of four centenarians to call to mind a hundred thousand cycles of time every day in his life, all four would die or ever they could count them all.

"The cycles of time that have elapsed are more numerous than all the sands that lie between the source and the mouth of the Ganges. The bones left by a single individual in his passage from birth to birth during a single cycle of time would form a pile so huge that were all the mountains of Vepulla-range to be gathered up and piled in a heap, that heap of mountains would appear as naught beside it. The head of every man has been cut off so many times in his previous states of existence, either as a human being or as an animal, as to cause him to shed blood more abundant than all the water contained in the four great oceans.

"For so long a time as this," concludes the Buddha, "you have endured suffering, you have endured agony, you have endured calamity. In view of this, you have every reason to feel disgust and aversion for all existing things and to free yourselves from them."²

4. ILLUSTRATIONS FROM THE LEGENDS OF THE SAINTS.

The Legends of the Saints contain much to the same effect. For example, in *Petavatthu* ii. 13, stanza 12, the Buddha thus addresses *Ubbari*, weeping for her dead husband: "You have been a woman, you have been a man, you have been a beast. Consider! there is no limit to the number of your past lives" (*atitānaṃ pariyanto na dissati*). There are several fine specimens in the *Dhammapada Commentary*.³ In i. 1 *Cakkhupāla* says to himself: "In the round of existences without conceivable beginning, there is no counting the number of times you

² Incidentally it may be said that this *Anamatagga Samyutta* is the gospel of Buddhism in a nutshell.

³ For a complete translation of these legends, see my *Buddhist Legends from the Dhammapada Commentary*, Harvard Oriental Series, vols. 28-30.

have been blind" (*anamataggasmim̐ saṃsāravatṭe tava anak-khikakālassa gaṇanā n'atthi*). In ii. 1. 6, end, *Sāmāvatī*, just before she is burned to death, admonishes her attendants as follows: "Even with the [infinite] knowledge of a Buddha, it would be no easy matter to count the number of times our bodies have thus been burned, as we have passed from birth to birth in the round of existences without conceivable beginning" (*anamatagge saṃsāre*).

In viii. 12 the Buddha thus comforts the bereaved *Paṭācārā*: "In weeping over the death of sons and others dear to you in this round of existences, you have shed tears more abundant than all the water contained in the four great oceans." The story goes on to say that as the Buddha thus discoursed on the Beginningless (*evam̐ Satthari anamataggapariyāyam̐ kathente*), her grief was assuaged. In xiii. 4 the Buddha thus addresses *Abhaya*, sorrowing over the sudden death of his nautch-girl: "There is no measuring the tears you have thus shed over the death of this girl in the round of existences without conceivable beginning." In xiii. 7 the Buddha thus comforts a weaver who has lost his daughter: "Grieve not, for in the round of existences without conceivable beginning you have thus shed over the death of your daughter tears more abundant than all the water contained in the four great oceans."

5. ETYMOLOGY AND MEANING OF PRĀKRIT *aṇavayagga*.

Prākṛit *aṇavayagga* is the exact equivalent of Pāli *anamatagga*, sound for sound, and conveys precisely the same idea. It occurs in one of Jacobi's selections from the Prākṛit:⁴ *Abhii . . . aṇāiyam̐ aṇavayaggaṃ saṃsārakantāraṃ aṇupariyaṭṭissai*. Meyer translates the passage as follows:⁵ 'Abhii . . . will stray to and fro in the beginningless, endless tanglewood of the *saṃsāra*.' But *aṇavayagga* is here very evidently employed as a synonym of *aṇāi* (Sanskrit *anādi*). It is a familiar practice of Hindu writers, whether Sanskrit, Pāli, or Prākṛit, to set side by side two or three or four synonymous expressions for the sake of greater emphasis and clearness. The passage should be translated as follows: 'Abhii . . . will stray to and fro in the tangle-

⁴ H. Jacobi, *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī*, p. 33¹⁶⁻¹⁸.

⁵ J. J. Meyer, *Hindu Tales*, pp. 113 f.

wood of the saṃsāra, which has no beginning, no known starting-point.'

6. ETYMOLOGY AND MEANING OF SANSKRIT *anavarāgra*.

The epithet commonly applied to the saṃsāra in Classical Sanskrit is *anādi*, 'beginningless.'⁶ But in Buddhistic Sanskrit, which may be aptly characterized by saying that it is nothing more than Sanskritized Pāli, the word *anādi* is never thus applied. Instead is used *anavarāgra*, a back-formation from the Pāli-Prākṛit.⁷ Since the compound negative prefix *an-a-* does not occur in Sanskrit⁸ the Sanskrit writers were hard put to it to coin a word resembling *anamatagga* *aṇavayagga* both in sound and meaning. But their ingenuity was equal to the task. Ultimately from the Pāli *anamatagga*, but more immediately from the Prākṛit *aṇavayagga*, they evolved, by redivision and modification working under the influence of popular etymology, the word *anavarāgra*. This word should, in my opinion, be divided *an-* 'not' + *avara* 'in the past' + *agra* 'starting-point.' It thus means *having no starting-point in the past*, and expresses, although by no means with such emphasis, substantially the same idea as Pāli-Prākṛit *anamatagga* *aṇavayagga*.

The correct interpretation of Pāli *anamatagga*, Prākṛit *aṇavayagga*, Sanskrit *anavarāgra*, is of the greatest importance to a correct understanding of the fundamental teachings of the Buddha. For the primary mission of the Buddha was to deliver mankind from the terrible jungle, the frightful ocean, of the round of existences, and the aspect of the round of existences which haunted the mind of the Buddha, the aspect with which he terrified the minds of his hearers, was its aspect as *anamatagga*.

It is utterly impossible, says the Buddha, for a human being so much as to imagine a beginning of this frightful round of existences. But there is a way for him to make an end of it. If he would be delivered from the horrors of repeated existences, he must get rid of Craving, the cause of rebirth. He must enter upon the Noble Eightfold Path and follow it to the end, even

⁶ See Böttlingk-Roth, *sub voce*.

⁷ See *Divyāvadāna*, 197¹⁵⁻¹⁸; *Mahāvastu*, i. 346-8, iii. 2738.

⁸ See my paper on The Compound Negative Prefix *an-a-* in Greek and Indic, *American Journal of Philology*, XXXIX 299 ff.

to the plucking out of the Eye of Existence, even to Nibbāna.
For,—

Not only does this Path destroy ill-will,
But it also shuts the gate of hell,
And utterly dries up that boundless, frightful
Ocean of suffering, the round of existences,
Whose beginning it is utterly impossible to imagine.

Na kevalaṃ ayaṃ maggo dosanāsaṇaṃ eva ca
Karoti atha kho 'pāyadvāraṃ pi pidheti ca
Anamatagga-saṃsāra-vatṭa-dukkha-mahodadhiṃ
Aparaṃ atighoraṃ ca soseti ca asesato.

Abhidhammāvatāra, 1333 f.

EUGENE WATSON BURLINGAME.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

VI.—PARADISE LOST 9. 506; NATIVITY HYMN 133-153.

The few who nowadays read the whole of *Paradise Lost* must have been struck with the lines in the Ninth Book which describe the splendor of the tempting serpent (495 ff.), and close, after the poet's wont, with a pendant cluster of mythological comparisons:

Never since of serpent kind
Lovelier, not those that in Illyria changed
Hermione and Cadmus, or the god
In Epidaurus.

But why Hermione? *Harmonia* was the name of Cadmus' wife.

The great Bentley scented corruption throughout the text of *Paradise Lost*. It was contaminated, he maintained, by a perverted amanuensis. 'The Ignorant,' he says, 'mistakes Hermione, the daughter of Menelaus and Helena, for Harmonia, the daughter of Mars and Venus, wife of Cadmus.' 'Slashing' Bentley is out-slashed by Keightley: 'Here is a strange mistake, and which proves how little the poet's memory was to be relied on. One would think that any schoolboy would know that the name of Cadmus's wife was Harmonia.' Other editors attempt no explanation, except Newton; he thinks Milton found 'Hermione and Cadmus' more musical than 'Harmonia and Cadmus'—which it is.

That Milton, even as a schoolboy, knew better than Keightley supposed is shown by a sentence in one of his Prolusions:¹ 'Hinc Harmoniam Jovis et Electrae fuisse filiam reverenda credidit antiquitas, quae cum Cadmo nuptui data esset,' etc.

In truth Milton had documentary precedent for *Hermione* instead of *Harmonia*. It is a frequent variant in mediæval manuscripts of certain texts, together with a variety of intermediate forms—*Harmonie*, *Hermonia*, *Harmiona*, *Hermiona*. The text in which Milton was most likely to observe this variant was Statius' *Thebaid*. The name *Harmonia* occurs nine times—at 2. 267, 272, 290; 3. 271; 4. 206; 7. 603; 8. 236; 9. 824;

¹ *De Sphaerarum Concentu*, Prose Works, ed. Symmons, 6. 154.

10. 893. In nine of the manuscripts, all of an inferior group, written at various dates from the tenth to the fifteenth century, the reading is *Hermione* (with inflectional differences). None of these manuscripts was collated before Lindenbrog's² edition of 1600, in which this variant is recorded, though not incorporated in the text.³ *Hermione* is, however, the reading in the Cruceus edition of Statius, Paris, 1618. Nor is this variant confined to the text, but occurs also in the commentary by Lactantius, on 1. 179, 288, 680; 2. 266, 272; 3. 269, 274, and is so reprinted in the edition in which Milton did his reading of Statius.⁴ The variant appears again in the *Narrationes* of Lactantius 3.16 (*Auctores Mythographi Latini*, ed. van Staveren, p. 297). But a far more significant instance is found in the scholia of the Pseudacron to Horace, *Ars Poetica* 187: 'Cadmus et Hermione in angues conversi sunt. Nam Hermione filia Martis et Veneris dicitur fuisse.' All the manuscripts which contain this scholium read *Hermione*,⁵ and Milton might have read it either in quotation or in paraphrase in at least eight editions of Horace prior to 1654.⁶ These instances are enough to indicate how well-known the variant probably was to one who read his classics as thoroughly and extensively as did Milton.

But how old was this variant, and how did it first occur? Critical apparatus sufficient for a final answer is wanting, but, of the instances cited, the scholium of the Pseudacron seems to be the oldest. All the manuscripts containing it clearly refer themselves to a common origin, not later than 450-500.⁷ An earlier date for the variant I have not found. As for the extant manuscripts of the texts here cited, *Hermione* occurs in every century from the tenth to the fifteenth.

Circumstances easily suggest themselves which may have led to a confusion of *Harmonia* with *Hermione*. Neither of the

² See Kohlmann's edition of the *Thebaid*, p. 39 and n.

³ Kohlmann, Preface. In his note on 2. 267, he seems to imply that Lindenbrog reads *Hermione*, but the copies in the Bodleian and the British Museum read *Harmonia*.

⁴ On other books in Milton's library see Pattison, *Life of Milton*, p. 17; *AJP*. XXII 344. His copy of Pindar is in the Harvard Library.

⁵ Pseudacron, ed. O. Keller, vol. II, p. 340.

⁶ These I have examined. How greatly this number might be increased a glance at the list in the British Museum catalogue will show.

⁷ Pseudacron, ed. Keller, vol. I, p. xlii; vol. II, p. viii.

personages in mythology so named was very distinct or important. The first assimilation of the name *Harmonia* to *Hermione* may have been felt in the not infrequent Greek spelling, *Harmonie*, or in the Latin spelling, *Hermiona*. More advanced intermediate stages are suggested by the variety of spellings given above. *Hermione*, furthermore, seems to have been frequently a name for women, especially in the Empire, and later amongst the Christians,⁸ and a familiar name often displaces a similar but less familiar one. Then, if the error first occurred in a scholium, it was less likely to be corrected than in poetry or literary prose. Once established, it seems to have persisted through the centuries of decline in scholarship, and to have withstood correction even during the Renaissance down to Milton's time.

An instance of it in Boccaccio's *Genealogia Deorum* shows how common the error was. He twice tells the story of Cadmus and Harmonia (2. 63; 9. 37), in the first instance using the name *Hermione*, and in the second, *Harmonia*. In both cases Boccaccio draws from the same sources—Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (4. 562 ff.), and Jerome's version of the Second Book of the *Chronica* of Eusebius. But he could not have got the variant from Ovid, because in his account of Cadmus Ovid does not mention Harmonia; nor from Jerome, by any variants recorded in the best editions of that text. Evidently Boccaccio was familiar with both forms, and felt no scrupulous preference between them. It is not strange, then, if to Milton the variant *Hermione* was so well-known that he felt free to use it for the improvement of his cadence.

Bentley was seventy when he published his *Milton*. Even if his great powers were prematurely declining, it yet seems strange that he should have forgotten what he must previously have observed somewhat carefully on at least three occasions. He was the first to collate the Codex Roffensis of the *Thebaid*, which consistently reads *Hermiona*. He was also the first to collate a manuscript of this text at St. Peter's College, Cambridge, in which the same variant is found throughout.⁹ Furthermore his notes on the *Ars Poetica* in his edition of Horace

⁸ De-Vit, *Onomasticon*, s. v.

⁹ *Thebaid*, ed. Kohlmann, pp. x, xiv.

show what we should expect, a familiar use of the scholia of the Pseudacron.

The familiar lines in Milton's *On the Morning of Christ's Nativity* describing the song of the angelic host close with these stanzas:

For, if such holy song
 Enwrap our fancy long,
 Time will run back and fetch the Age of Gold;
 And speckled Vanity
 Will sicken soon and die,
 And leprous Sin will melt from earthly mould;
 And Hell itself will pass away,
 And leave her dolorous mansions to the peering day.

Yea, Truth and Justice then
 Will down return to men,
 Orbed in a rainbow; and, like glories wearing,
 Mercy will sit between,
 Throned in celestial sheen,
 With radiant feet the tissued clouds down steering;
 And Heaven, as at some festival,
 Will open wide the gates of her high palace hall.

But wisest Fate says no,
 This must not yet be so;
 The Babe yet lies in smiling infancy
 That on the bitter cross
 Must redeem our loss.

Various sources of details in this passage from the Psalms, the *Iliad*, the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, and Horace, have been noted by the editors.¹⁰ But the thought as a whole is that in the Fifth Book of the *Divine Institutes* of Lactantius. In chapter 5 he has recounted the legend of the Golden Age and Saturn's reign, the departure of Justice from the earth, and the ensuing cruelty of men beginning with the reign of Jupiter. This later régime is described as one of injustice, violence, and imposture, the opposites of Milton's Justice, Mercy, and Truth. These abuses, he says, shall continue as long as paganism endures. 'And now (in chapter 6) ¹¹ nothing remained of the pious and excellent condition of the preceding age; but Justice, being ban-

¹⁰ See Albert S. Cook, *Notes on Milton's Nativity Ode*, Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences, vol. XV, pp. 345, 6.

¹¹ Fletcher's translation, Ante-Nicene Christian Library, vol. XXI.

ished, and drawing with her Truth, left to men error, ignorance, and blindness.' Then, in chapter 7; 'But God, as a most indulgent parent, when the last time approached, sent a messenger [Christ] to bring back that old age, and Justice, which had been put to flight, that the human race might not be agitated by very great and perpetual errors. Therefore the appearance of that golden time returned, and Justice was restored to the earth, but was assigned to a few; and this Justice is nothing else than the pious and religious worship of the one God.' But the Age of Gold has not been suffered wholly to return because 'virtue can neither be discerned, unless it has vices opposed to it; nor be perfect unless it is exercised by its adversity'¹². . . . This is evidently the cause which effects that, although Justice is sent to men, yet it cannot be said that a Golden Age exists; because God has not taken away evil, that He might retain that diversity which alone preserves the mystery of a divine religion.' Again, in chapter 8; 'Lay aside every evil thought from your hearts, and that Golden Age will at once return to you, which you cannot attain by any other means than by beginning to worship the true God. But you [pagans] long for Justice on the earth, while the worship of false gods continues, which cannot possibly come to pass. . . . How happy and how golden would be the condition of human affairs, if throughout the world gentleness, and piety, and peace, and innocence, and equity, and temperance, and faith, took up their abode!' The rest of the Fifth Book arraigns the injustice, falsity, and cruelty of paganism, to which the coming of Christ will, in time, put an end. The burden of Milton's hymn is the triumph of the new-born Savior over the pagan deities.

CHARLES G. OSGOOD.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

¹² Lat. *adversis*. Better, 'its opposites'?

REVIEWS

A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare. The Life and Death of King John. Edited by HORACE HOWARD FURNESS, JR. Philadelphia, J. B. Lippincott Company, 1919 [1920].

After an interval of more than six years, *King John*, the eighteenth play in the New Variorum Shakespeare, has at last appeared. If the time necessary to complete this edition be computed by the period between *Julius Caesar* (which appeared in 1913) and the present play it will be seen that the work will not be finished until about 2028. It is therefore surely the duty of every reviewer to press upon Dr. FURNESS, with the most profound respect for the great achievement of his father so satisfactorily carried on by himself, the advisability of engaging the services of a corps of editors who, working under his general direction, would be able to issue the remaining plays within a reasonable number of years and who could make the completion of this great edition the outstanding accomplishment of Shakespearean scholarship in America in this generation. That such a coöperative undertaking is easily possible has been proved by Professor R. M. Alden's Variorum edition of the *Sonnets*. If reluctance to assign the major responsibility for any one play to someone else makes the thought of divided editorship distasteful to Dr. FURNESS, it might still be possible (following the example again set by Professor Alden) to portion out certain problems in each drama—the rival merits of quarto and folio texts; the date of the play; sources; stage history; foreign commentators; etc.—to a group of sub-editors. Much time could be thus saved. Everyone, I am sure, will sympathize with Dr. FURNESS in his obvious feeling of filial piety which would naturally make of the New Variorum a sort of family monument; and there would be no disposition on the part of any Shakespearean scholar to claim more than a very subordinate share of the responsibility and honor of the task.

The text of the present play is a reprint of that of the First Folio according to the plan adopted by the elder Dr. Furness after some three or four plays had been printed with an eclectic text. It is noteworthy that in this, unlike earlier volumes of this edition, there is no uniformity in the reproduction of typographical blemishes such as "leads," raised or dropt letters, and lines in need of justification. Some of these are reproduced; some not; but the matter is not of sufficient importance to war-

rant offering a complete list of such variants from the Folio. On the other hand, certain errors in the reprint, whether of spelling or of punctuation, are worthy of record both because such departures from the original where the minutest accuracy is desiderated in the reprint should be noted and because the paucity of such departures is better evidence of Dr. FURNESS's general carefulness than would be any mere unsubstantiated words of commendation. I have had for purposes of comparison only the Methuen facsimile of the Devonshire copy of the Folio; it is therefore possible (since variants exist between different copies of the Folio) that what I have noted as an error may be an exact reproduction of the text of Dr. FURNESS's copy of the original. But it is unlikely that such is the case in each of the following nine or ten lines. Be it noted, first, that in various places in the text it is difficult to distinguish between a battered lower-case "r" and a battered lower-case "t." In some instances Dr. FURNESS prints "t" (e. g. II, i, 557: "daughtet"); in others "r" (e. g. V, iii, 12: "rhe"). There are many other places in which the question whether the letter is "r" or "t" is quite as doubtful (e. g. II, i, 559 and 605).

Setting aside this doubtful point, I note the following errors: I, i, 130: add period at end of line.—I, i, 168: add period after "K"—II, i, 119: add the mark of contraction over the o in "fro"—II, i, 321: add comma after "France"—III, i, 172: for "pencil" read "pencill"—IV, i, 141: delete comma after "sleep"—for "fit" read "sit" (long s)—V, vii, 61: for "faile" read "saile" (long s)—V, vii, 118: the s in "teares" seems to be inverted and is of a larger font.

It may be noted also that, though in other necessary places Dr. FURNESS has facilitated reference by adding the modern numbering to acts and scenes misnumbered in the Folio, he has neglected to do this at the beginning of Act V, where the absurd Folio enumeration "Actus Quartus, Scaena prima" remains uncorrected. I have noted a very few errors in the text variants, a portion of the editorial work where the possibilities of errors in proof are enormous and upon which most painstaking care has been spent. The commentary is excellently printed; I have noted not more than six or seven errors. There are four small misprints in the text of *The Troublesome Reign*. It is not very apparent why, since the spelling of the old play is modernized, the punctuation should not have been somewhat rectified.

The to-be-expected loyalty of Dr. FURNESS to the Folio text is seen in the decisions which he renders in several disputed passages; and in the rare instances in which he favors a departure from that text his verdict is given reluctantly. The two most noteworthy cases of his abandonment of the Folio are: II, i, 345 where in the original text the Citizen of Angiers who

parleys with the opposing kings is called "Hubert"; and III, i, 143 (a line that has called down a perfect avalanche of commentary) where Dr. FURNESS is inclined to accept the emendation "uptrimmed" for the "untrimmed" of the Folio. Dr. FURNESS's own novel interpretations of difficult passages are few in number; for the most part he plays the modest though arduous part of the compiler and arbiter; but four suggestions that he advances are of sufficient interest and importance to justify some mention of them even in a brief review.

A line that has occasioned more comment than almost any other in the play is Constance's "For grief is proud and makes his owner stoope" (III, i, 72), a sentiment puzzling in itself and apparently contradicting what has gone before in Constance's speech. Dr. FURNESS suggests, though with diffidence, that "owner" may mean "one who acknowledges or recognizes." This interpretation, which precisely fits the context and makes the word "owner" apply to the kings for whom Constance declares that she will wait, seems to the present reviewer excellent.

IV, ii, 120: "Where is my mother's care?" The letter "c" in the last word is so battered and worn in the Folio text that many editors have taken it for an "e" and therefore read "Where is my mother's eare?" Dr. FURNESS shows that the letter in question is a somewhat defaced italic "c" of a different font from that usually employed but which appears earlier in the play in one word and again later in the play in another, in both which places there can be no doubt whatever that the letter is "c" not "e." He thus establishes the Folio text beyond peradventure and in doing so affords convincing proof, for those who may need it, of the value of letter-by-letter study of the Folio text.

V, ii, 150: "Your Nation's crow." Dr. FURNESS destroys faith in an explanation hitherto curiously unquestioned that the reference here is to the Gallic cock as a national symbol. He shows (as any former editor might have shown, but did not) that the cock was not used by the French as a national emblem until long after Shakespeare's time.

V, vi, 18: Hubert explains to the Bastard that "grief and endless night" hindered him from recognizing him at once. The adjective "endless" has occasioned a good deal of comment. Dr. FURNESS suggests that Hubert refers, not to the actual darkness of the seemingly endless night of anxiety through which Hubert is passing, but to the "endless night of death." Though this interpretation is feebly substantiated by the fact that Hubert goes on to report that King John is dying, it yet seems to me unnecessary to give to the phrase any such unliteral meaning. The simplest interpretation (as Dr. FURNESS himself so often advises) is apt to be the best; and accordingly I believe that

Hubert intends no more than that the darkness of the night, which to his anxious mind seems endless, prevented him from recognizing the Bastard at once.

I am not certain that Dr. FURNESS was well advised in omitting all passages from the chronicles in the section of his appendix dealing with the source of the play. It is true that all modern critics regard it as certain that Shakespeare merely remodeled the older *Troublesome Reign of King John*; but this fact is not proof that he did not use also material from other sources. Thus, the bursting of the bowels of the monk who tasted the poison that he gave to the king, which is mentioned in Grafton's *Chronicle* and is referred to by Shakespeare, is not mentioned in the older play. Perhaps, however, the excerpts from various chronicles given in the course of the commentary are sufficient; to reprint larger extracts in the appendix would have swelled an already large volume inordinately.

An astonishing omission from the section of the Appendix dealing with the "Dramatic and Poetical Versions of the Life of King John" is that of any reference to Robert Davenport's by no means negligible play *King John and Matilda*.

It is regrettable that the excellent plan, followed in former volumes, of separating foreign from English criticism has not been adhered to in this play. Some needless confusion might have been avoided had Dr. FURNESS occasionally supplied editorial warnings in brackets in various places in the appendix, as he has done in the commentary, where earlier critics have made positive misstatements. Finally, it may be remarked that it would be convenient if in future volumes of this edition Dr. FURNESS would refer to the latest and definitive editions of various writers rather than to older, no longer standard texts. Thus, his references to Middleton are to Dyce's rather than to Bullen's edition; those to Nashe are to Grosart's rather than McKerrow's; those to Donne are to Grosart's rather than Grierson's. The edition of Ward's *History of English Dramatic Literature* employed is that of 1875.

The foregoing comments, of necessity limited almost entirely to a few corrections of detail, must not be construed as in any way in contradiction to the feeling of admiration and respect with which the reviewer desires to greet this latest instalment of a truly monumental work.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

Boethius: the Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy. Edited by H. F. STEWART and E. K. RAND. London: W. Heinemann, 1918. 240 pp.

The volume devoted to Boethius in the Loeb Classical Library contains the five Theological Tractates and the Consolation of Philosophy. The Latin text has been carefully prepared by Professor RAND, who may fairly claim to have acquired an especial competence in this field. The translation of the Theological Tractates is the joint work of the two editors. This is an excellent translation of some very difficult Latin. For the Consolation, Dr. STEWART has revised a good old English version, by 'I. T.' (1609), and presents it here "with such alterations as are demanded by a better text, and the requirements of modern scholarship." Altogether, the volume is a welcome addition to the Loeb series, and a distinct gain to both classical and theological studies. Unfortunately, there are too many misprints: p. 15, l. 18, 'Sun,' for 'Son'; 70, 271, 'contemplationem' for 'contemplatio'; 138, 29; 'nonnullus' for 'nonnullos'; 214, 40, 'quod' for 'quo'; 239, 13, 'wants' for 'want'; 246, 37, 'ne' for 'nec'; 254, 35, 'quidem' for 'quidam'; 256, 14, 'ut' for 'tu.' At p. 271, l. 1, the word 'different' has dropped out; at 371, 22 the word 'judgment' is omitted. At p. 149, l. 33 'I. T.'s translation is wrong: "but I exceedingly marvel to see what things they hoped to bring to pass" ("sed quae speraverint effecisse vehementer admiror"). George Colville did better in 1556: "but I do maruayle gretlye howe they can brynge to passe the thynges that they haue taken in hande." At p. 254, l. 4 the conjecture 'Aristophanes,' for 'Aristoteles,' is not very convincing. Finally, one or two additional parallels might have been cited in the notes. At p. 246, l. 15, "et serviat ultima Thyle," cp. Verg. Geor. I 30; at 346, 127, "iustissimum et aequi servantissimum," cp. Aen. II 426-7. For some reason, the bibliography, which is a regular feature of the Loeb series, is omitted from this volume.

W. P. MUSTARD.

Sancti Augustini Vita scripta a Possidio Episcopo. Edited with revised text, introduction, notes, and an English version. By HERBERT T. WEISKOTTEN. Princeton University Press, 1919. 175 pp.

This is a dissertation recently presented at Princeton University for the degree of Ph. D. Possidius, Bishop of Calama, was an intimate friend of Augustine for "about 40 years." His Vita is the main source of our knowledge of the great churchman's life—as man and as bishop—from his conversion in 387

to his death in 430. It was probably written in 432, or a little later. Dr. WEISKOTTEN has spent much toil on the text, and has tried to present "a revision of previous editions in the light of fuller evidence from a larger number of MSS." His notes are mainly concerned with matters of ecclesiastical history and with the many biblical allusions and quotations in the text. His translation is usually a faithful rendering of the text he adopts, but there are a few cases of inconsistency, or inaccuracy. 'Securus,' p. 47, 16, is hardly 'secure'; 'editos' (of books) is hardly 'edited' (62, 24; 110, 6). 'Nimium,' 136, 25, is not 'doubtless'; 'praedicti,' 106, 12, is not 'illustrious.' 'Pervasum,' 64, 25, can hardly mean 'escaped.' At p. 84, 13, there must be something wrong about either the text or the translation, or both: 'provectibus quoque et studiis favens erat, et exsultans omnium bonorum,' 'he also delighted in the pursuit of his studies and rejoiced in all good.'

W. P. MUSTARD.

The Correspondence of Cicero. Vol. IV. Second edition. By TYRRELL and PURSER. 1918. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., Ltd.; London, Longmans, Green & Co.

The long awaited revision of this fourth volume is now at hand.¹ Despite several excisions and much suppression of material the volume has increased to 633 well-packed pages. The introduction has been altered chiefly by the addition of numerous foot-notes. A few appendices have, however, been inserted at the end to relieve unwieldy notes under the text, the notes have undergone a thorough overhauling, and the critical appendix has been improved particularly along the lines of Sjögren's suggestions. New and complete collations are apparently not offered, but they were hardly to be expected in view of the progress that Sjögren is making.

Notwithstanding the deprecatory modesty of the introduction, the book is almost a new piece of work, and it should be procured by all who are interested in Tullian studies. The reader may be assured that despite a tendency toward conservatism in the new material offered the book has lost none of those qualities that have distinguished this edition of the letters: a sure political sense, an accurate and withal a sympathetic reading of character, and a penetrating understanding of Roman society.

Since this is a second edition, I shall only offer a few sug-

¹ The second edition of the fifth volume, somewhat too hastily revised, was issued in 1915 when the first edition of that volume was found to be out of print.

gestions which may be of use to some of the many readers which it deserves to find.

Page xiv, "600 gladiators"; In Ad Att. vii 14, 2 we have *scutorum* 150. Has this been misread for DC?

Page xvii, note 1: Cicero says quite definitely in Pro Rabirio 22, that Labienus was a Picentine, and Catullus (Carmen 114) calls him Firmanus, see Am. Jour. Phil. 1919, 408.

Page xviii: on Caesar's route a reference should be made to Peaks, Class. Rev. 1904, 346.

Page lxiv: Crassus, not Cassius, was assigned to Syria by the Trebonian law.

Page ci: the new essay on Cornificius is welcome; but there seems to be no reason for supposing that he was "praetor in 47 B. C."

Page 58, (cohortes) . . . *missum* facias: Pompey may well be criticized if he used *missum* thus as a participle, but he may have felt it as a supine.

Page 98, note on § 5: "Lepidus" (*bis*), should be Lentulus.

Page 180, note on § 2: "ii qui . . . an allusion to Domitius." Rather, a reference to Cicero's explicit mention of Lentulus in Ad Att. ix 11, a 3.

Page 228, note: the reference is to letter 382, 8, not to 372.

Page 233: the explanatory introduction is erroneous. Indeed the editor's first note on the letter is correct in making this letter an answer to no. 383, rather than to advice given several months before.

Page 246: the explanation of *Caelianum illud* here and in the following notes still seems unconvincing. See Class. Phil. 1919, 287.

Page 363: the editor seems not to have justified his rejection of the MS reading *intellegerim*.

TENNEY FRANK.

Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. II. New York, University Press Association; Cambridge, Harvard University Press; New Haven, Yale University Press, 1918. In memoriam Jesse Benedict Carter, Frederic Crowninshield, Richard Norton.

In the account of the Recent Work of the School of Fine Arts, it is stated that the Trustees have decided to present each year in the *Memoirs* a selection of plates reproducing the work of the Fellows of the School of Fine Arts, and this volume presents fifteen subjects including a Capital of the temple of Mars Ultor, the Palace of Domitian on the Palatine, restored, a restoration of the Ponte Rotto, a restoration of the Circular Pavilion at

Hadrian's Villa near Tivoli, the Villa Gamberaia, a Bas-relief by Gregory, an Equestrian Statue by Friedlander, and a Peasant by Jennewein. Among the paintings are a Fig Tree by Stickroth, the Rape of Europa by Cowles, Commerce by Davidson. These samples show beyond a doubt that the Academy is training some very important architects, sculptors, and painters whose work will soon be famous.

The article on Terracotta Arulae by Mrs. VAN BUREN is a scholarly and exhaustive treatment, with a chronological table, of small terracotta altars which, though not of great artistic merit in themselves, influenced sculpture in relief and especially that of Roman sarcophagi. The sequence is traced from the neolithic "table-leg altar" through the Babylonian variations and the Mycenaean culture to the terracotta altars, the type losing the original pillar-like form and becoming squarer in section until it culminates in the altars of Calvinus and Verminus.

Miss ROBERTS' unillustrated article on The Gallic Fire and Roman Archives is a valuable historical study determining the extent of the Gallic fire in 387 B. C. Miss ROBERTS concludes that the temples of Saturn, Castor, Dios Fidius, Diana, Ceres, and perhaps of Juno survived, and that the Gauls had more regard for the Roman temples and archives than is generally supposed. An important study for students of Livy.

Professor VAN BUREN's Studies in the Archaeology of the Forum at Pompeii corrects certain traditional statements about well-known monuments such as the great cult statue of Jupiter, the great inscription on the pavement of the Forum, the arch at the south end of the Forum, the Curia, and the school which has hitherto been explained as a stoa or market, and about the changes in the Forum due to the Roman colonists. Professor VAN BUREN's scholarly studies at Pompeii reveal his intimate knowledge of that city and indicate that much still remains to be done in interpreting the remains at Pompeii.

STANLEY LOTHROP's exhaustive study of the Roman painter Pietro Cavallini, with forty-five artistic and interesting plates, concludes the volume. Especial attention is given to the decoration of the Palazzo Pubblico in Perugia, which previous students have neglected and which LOTHROP attributes to Cavallini or some close follower. Almost all of Cavallini's works are reproduced, many of the photographs having been taken by LOTHROP himself.

These *Memoirs* continue the high standard set by the previous volume (see A. J. P. XL 108). The printing is beautifully done, and there are many handsome illustrations.

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON.

REPORTS.

HERMES LIV (1919), 1 and 2.

Metrische Beiträge (1-45). K. Münscher assumes an ancient popular measure consisting of four theses that were either independent or associated in ascending or descending rhythm with arses of one or two syllables. From this he derives the paroemiakon, lekythion, ithyphallikon etc. In his survey of early and late examples he makes numerous interesting observations.

Lesefrüchte (46-74). U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff.

Literarhistorische Beiträge V (75-86). W. A. Baehrens reads the Lucilian verse in Pliny n. h. praef. 7: +Manium [Persium] haec legere nolo etc., and combines it with Persium non curo legere etc. (Cic. de orat. II 25). He explains the intrusion of Persium in the Pliny MS.; also why Cicero quoted the line, cited by Pliny, in his de rep.—2. B. emends and assembles verses that Lucilius (Sat. xxix) derived from the Hymnis of Cæcilius just as Horace (Sat. II 3, 259 ff.) adapted verses from the Eunuchus of Terence.—3. Lucilius' earliest publication (xxvi-xxx) was in 123 B. C.; but the concilium deorum in book I satirizing Lupus, princeps senatus, must have been written 125 B. C. immediately after the death of Lupus, just as Seneca wrote his Apocolocyntosis soon after the death of Claudius.

Glykera und Menander (87-93). A. Körte shows that the romantic relation between G. and M., pictured by Alciphron and accepted as historical by Christ-Schmid (Ed. 5, II 1, 29) is pure fiction. He discusses the Athenian hetaerae in Hellenistic literature.

Augustinus und die Topik der Aretalogie (94-103). Ad. Jülicher objects to the examples Werner cites in Hermes 1918 p. 242 (cf. AJP XL, p. 216) to illustrate the practice of retelling an old oft-told story as a personal experience. He especially defends Augustinus against the imputation of practising such a fraud.

Miscellen: F. Hiller v. Gaertringen (104-107). Δεύτεραι φροντίδες.—Th. Thalheim (108) emends and comments on Demosthenes XXXVIII 12; 21, 22; XLII 1; XLIII 41.—H. F. Müller (109-110) points out correspondences between Paul's classification of men into σαρκικοί, ψυχικοί and πνευματικοί and the threefold classification of Plotinus.—U. Wilcken (111-112) from an examination of the Berlin papyrus 889 is able to identify the supposed uprising of the Jews in Egypt in 136/7 A. D.

with the well-known one in 116/7 A. D.—Berichtigung (112) zu Bd. LI (1916), S. 478 f.

Zur Geschichte des Latinerbundes (113-173). A. Rosenberg has worked out an historic sketch of the Latin league from inscriptional, topographical and other evidence, discarding most of the matter that Livy obtained from the later annalists. According to R. the Latin league preceded Rome in a policy of conquest and colonization, and Rome actually joined the league on terms of equality with the other members in the V century. But about 400 B. C. when the aristocratic autocracy gave way to the rising tide of popular government, Rome began to gain step by step a predominating influence in the Latin league. In the treaty with Carthage 343 B. C. members of the Latin league appear as subjects of Rome.

Caesaris servus (174-186). M. Bang regards Caesaris servus as the designation of the property of the man Caesar, like the old Gai por, Luci por. He shows its occurrence in inscriptions until the time of Hadrian; but it was finally superseded by Augusti servus. On the other hand as Augustus originated as the title of the emperor it may be for this reason that Augusti libertus was a regular term from the beginning in order to designate the free citizen like the title milites Augusti. Variations of the above with noster etc. are shown.

Eine vorplatonische Kunsttheorie (187-207). E. Howald derives the psychic katharsis of Aristotle's Poetics from the Pythagoreans. Aristoxenos' saying: *κάθαρσις σώματος διὰ τῆς ἱατρικῆς, ψυχῆς δὲ διὰ μουσικῆς* was a Leitmotiv of the Pythagoreans. This doctrine conflicts with the main thesis of mimesis; but Aristotle frequently included matter from divergent sources. H. discusses the Poetics, Politics ch. 8, Plato, Iamblichus etc.

Miscellen: P. Stengel (208-211) explains the meaning of *ἐνδοπα ἐνδέρεται* (cf. AJP XXIII, p. 336).—F. Hiller v. Gaertringen (211-215) restores the inscription IG I 350 b Suppl. p. 153, commemorating a dedication of Callimachus of Aphidna after the battle of Marathon (cf. Hermes XXXI (1896) pp. 150 f.).—R. Philippson (216-217) cites Plutarch to support his *ὁ* for Diel's *ἐν* in a passage of Philodemus. Only the godhead is *ἐν καὶ ταύτόν*; but man is *πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα* (cf. AJP XL 216).—O. Kern (217-219) discusses the spook *Γελλώ*, of which Porphyrius seems to have treated in some lost work.—F. Graefe (219-224) shows with citations from Herodotus, Thucydides, etc. that the ancients practised naval manœuvres in a way to satisfy the rules, which he quotes, of modern naval tactics.

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, Vol. XLII (1918) pts. 3, 4.

Pp. 133-168. Alfred Ernout. Cas en *-e-* et cas en *-i-* de la troisième déclinaison dans Lucrèce. A study of the confusion of forms in *-e-* and forms in *-i-* in the third declension. The writer gives complete statistics for the text of Lucretius, examining all the cases where confusion may have arisen, and comparing the spelling of the two Leyden manuscripts, O and Q, with the usage of the great official inscriptions of the Roman Republic. He finds that the consonant stems have largely influenced the declension of the vowel stems in *i*; that the influence of analogy was best resisted by the vowel stems which had best retained their distinctive *-i-* in the nominative singular. He deduces some practical rules for the constituting of a classical text. In the case of consonant stems, never admit an accusative singular in *-im*, or a nominative or accusative plural in *-is*; accept the ablative singular in *-i* only when it is expressly required by the metre. As for vowel stems, admit the accusative singular in *-im* only in words for which there is some formal evidence; accept the ablative in *-i*: (1) in all adjectives; (2) in participles and in words which have a nominative in *-is*, if it has good manuscript authority or is required by the metre. In the plural, always write the nominative in *-ēs*, and keep the accusative in *-is* for adjectives.

Pp. 169-251. Paul Jourdan. Notes de critique verbale sur Scribonius Largus. A study of the text of the *Compositiones*. The author was born about the beginning of the Christian era. He took part in the expedition which Claudius directed against Britain. His work was dedicated to an influential freedman Callistus; it was published probably after the year 47. M. Jourdan begins his study with some account of the principal editions: by Jean du Rueil, Paris, 1529; by the Danish scholar Jean Rhode, or Rhodius, Padua, 1655; by G. Helmreich, Leipzig, 1887.

Pp. 252-254. Bulletin bibliographique. Reviews of J. Brummer's *Vitae Vergilianae*, Leipzig, 1912, by Paul Lejay (Brummer has entirely ignored Sabbadini's important article in the *Studi italiani di Filologia classica*, 1907, p. 197); of Emily M. Dutton's *Studies in Greek prepositional phrases*, Chicago, 1913, and F. Agno's *Periculum criticum Ovidianum*, by G. Viallon; of Gaetano De Sanctis' *Storia dei Romani*, vol. III: *L'Età delle guerre puniche*, Turin, 1916-17, by Victor Chapot.

Revue des revues et publications d'Académies relatives à l'antiquité classique. Fascicules publiés en 1917, et tables, pp. 65-171.

Revue des comptes rendus d'ouvrages relatifs à l'antiquité classique, par J. Marouzeau, comptes rendus parus en 1915, pp. 1-85.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

BRIEF MENTION.

In these times of financial storm and stress magazines, especially technical magazines, have become what the French call 'struggle-for-lifeurs.' Banishment and curtailment of superfluities are indicated everywhere. While I was yet in charge of the Journal, I consulted in my perplexity the oracle of all good Grecians. The response came from the first verse of the slaughter of the suitors (the profiteers of the period) which tells of how the man of counsel stripped him of his rags, αὐτὰρ δ' γυμνώθη βακίων πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς. In that verse I read the doom of my Brief Mention rag-bag. But, owing to the intercession of friends, sentence was suspended and the obituary which I had prepared suppressed. But certain sentences of that composition of an historical or haply consolatory character have been deemed worthy of reproduction here.

Like the Romans, the Americans began to dabble in grammar before they had a literature of their own. In English, Lindley Murray, an American, held the lead for a long time. In Greek, Goodwin was the first American Hellenist to win substantial and enduring recognition in what some of us may be permitted to call the mother-country. To this American bent I, too, have yielded and for many years paid tribute to what the wicked might call the national Mumbo-Jumbo. But after decades of ploughing in grammatical furrows and stubbing the waste lands adjacent thereunto, I found myself hankering after the key of fields in which I disported myself in the early years of my long life of endeavour. Despairing of making any considerable additions to literature proper from which future generations might cull what the French call "pages choisies," I began to make up from a mass of manuscripts my own "pages choisies" and to deposit some of them from time to time in the department of the Journal long known as *Brief Mention*. Every now and then I received words of encouragement from personal correspondents and even words of commendation from the public press, but one great lesson of the strait sect in which I was brought up, not to think more highly of myself than I ought to think, has been forced upon me from various quarters. One critic, and that a pupil of my own, passed a damnatory sentence on the whole congeries of observations, which, as a French reviewer said to my great glee, escape analysis. 'Even the simplest *Brief Mention*,' wrote the stern censor, 'will lack meaning for any man unless he is encyclopaedic in his classical knowledge or is keeping close at hand the best glossary possible.' In other

words, *Brief Mention* is a tissue of recondite allusions further hidden by a Babylonish dialect of uncouth words, whereas, personally, I abhor pedantry, and my diction is regulated by a modest range of literary convention. If my critic is right, I must plead guilty to an utter lack of sympathetic imagination. Another censor of more amiable turn reproached me with giving up to *Brief Mention* what was meant for mankind. So to one the "risus ab angulo" sounds cracked; to another, the scant sunshine of this "riant nook" seems clouded by the dust of the schoolroom. 'Ahi, quanta malinconia!' to quote once more Fraccaroli,¹ whose taking off has brought sadness to all Pindaric scholars.

'A ripping good lecture,' said a distinguished English scholar to me after I had given one of my talks on Aristophanes at Harvard, adding, as if apologizing to himself for a conventional compliment to an American, 'We don't do that sort of thing any more in England.' It seems that I had not been able to avoid a semblance of wit and humour in discoursing on wit and humour in Aristophanes, a proceeding quite out of keeping with the prevalent gravity of English scholarship. I was a relatively old stager before I attracted the attention of British critics, who began by noticing in a sniffy way first my Pindar and then, after an interval, my collection of *Essays and Studies*. But rebukes direct and implied came too late to affect my equanimity. I have acted on the line which I found afterwards laid down by Flaubert. The only way to do anything really fine is to please one's self. Unfortunately, Flaubert himself was hard to please, and Cicero, vain as he was, expresses an artist's dissatisfaction with his own performances. It is only your Nero that says: *Qualis artifex pereo*. But one remembers St. Augustine and limps along the right path. The criticisms of the English reviewers were levelled at the Americanisms of my language and my attempts, seemingly unsuccessful, at a lighter vein. The Americanisms were all amply warranted by good English usage, and one of the defects was the tendency to indulge in allusions to the great English authors. Then there was the old-fashioned facetiousness.

To be called facetious is of itself a condemnation. Facetiousness belongs in an especial manner to the fashionable physician and the ecclesiastic of high degree. I had no set purpose to be facetious or jocose. And if in the last forty years the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY has shewn in *Brief Mention* or elsewhere, a proclivity to take a somewhat humorous view of life and letters, it has only manifested a national characteristic

¹ Cf. A. J. P. XV 502.

to be expected of an editor who has every right to be considered an American. Nothing is more national than the sense of humour and the manifestation of humour. There are those who think that the nation was born in the throes of the Civil War. Momus is older than Eileithyia (N. 7).

This characteristic of our people is one of the points that help to sustain Mr. Freeman's parallelism of the Sicily of old with the America of to-day. Every one who has read the *Ver-rines* will remember the tribute Cicero, the wit and humorist, paid to the witty and humorous Sicilian. Epicharmos might have been an American. The mime has an American cast: Sophron dyed off on Plato, and the admirers of Plato may recognize something Sicilian in Emerson. "Wherein the Americanism of our lighter vein consists, it is not easy to determine." No critical mind can be satisfied with the once popular resolution into overstatement and understatement, hyperbole and litotes, which are quite too primitive, quite too rudimental. Nor will a study of Mr. Starkie's commentary in his chapter "Aristotle on the Laughter in Comedy" serve to meet the conditions. Whimsicality and quizzicality are characteristic, it is true, but too elusive. Like flavour and scent, national humour defies analysis. What lies beyond the *raison démonstrative* of wit fails to be appreciated by the foreigner. I have recently read an article in which it is asserted that Americans have succeeded in making the Japanese laugh, but Nippon is irresponsive to Mark Twain. As for that matter, Captain Bairnsfather has announced that he intends to import American newspaper men to England in order to teach his countrymen how to appreciate the journalism of America. But nothing seems to rouse the ire of British critics more than the use of what they call journalese in the treatment of grammatical subjects, and for my part, I have for all the years of my travels through the Arabia deserta of Philology delighted in adding to my store of the pawkishnesses of Veitch and the snappishnesses of Lobeck. Immanuel Bekker is a quarry not to be neglected. The most atrabilarious critic can hardly repress a smile when Bekker persists in inflecting Meineke as if he were a Greek old woman. But the words of an old song, a song that was old when I was young, come back to me,

Shepherds, I have lost my love,
Have you seen my Anna?

Pastoral poetry is dead. There are no shepherds left, and my Ana will remain unseen for ever.

But not all English scholars are as obdurate as some of my critics. Two exceptions come up to my mind, one is Rendel Harris, but in his case residence in America may have added a tinge to his native sunshiny humour. The other is his friend,

Hope Moulton, whose treatment of the airy aorist and the impish imperfect brought upon him the severe censure of a reviewer of his *Prolegomena* to a Grammar of New Testament Greek (A. J. P. XXX 107). It seems strange that so joyous a spirit should have had so tragic an exit and that Moulton should have fallen a victim to the ruthless machinery of a German submarine. Of this misadventure Moulton's friend and mine, Rendel Harris, has written an account, unrivalled in vividness by any narrative of shipwreck since the shipwreck recorded in the Acts. From this account, which the writer, characteristically enough, thinks will in time to come be attributed by German critics to a conflation of St. Paul and Synesius, I am permitted to publish an extract describing the end of the gifted and ill-fated scholar:

Moulton was in the next place in the boat, a little further from me, and more exposed to the weather, and with no protection except a piece of tarpaulin which had been erected over his head, and over which the waves were constantly breaking. He had been very busy with the oars and with the baling as long as his strength lasted. I myself tried to row, but was too feeble, and was ordered off. He stuck to it until attacks of sickness stopped him. But up to the last he was doing everything he could for everybody, and won the admiration of all on board. They brought me word on Saturday morning early that he was sinking. I struggled to get to him, but in the few moments' delay he passed away, and before I could get across to him he was gone, and his body was lying on the side of the boat ready for last words and last actions. There was no need for prayers in the case of such as he, so I gave him a kiss of love for myself and for those that were his, and told him that I would care for his little girl, for whom he had been so anxious—and after that, the deep. That was Saturday morning.

I have somewhere expressed a mild surprise that a scholar such as Leopold Schmidt should have attached so much documentary importance to the apophthegms attributed to Pindar. Compare Introductory Essay, p. xiv, of my edition of Pindar.

Apophthegms, anecdotes, repartees, hoc genus omne are really *ferae naturae* liable to be caught by any literary game-keeper and assigned to this or that bag according to his good pleasure. Sometimes everything depends upon the assignment, or, to change the figure, upon the setting. A striking illustration of this has recently crossed my track. In my sketch of Bywater, I cited one of his anecdotes as shewing the scholar's relish for caustic humour, A. J. P. XXXVIII 409.

Pio Nono when in conversation with Cardinal Antonelli lit a cigarette and handed the case to the Cardinal, who said, "You know, Holiness, that I have not that vice." "You know, Eminence," replied the Pope, "that if it were a vice, you would have it."

To one who has read of Cardinal Antonelli's private life and is acquainted with Pio Nono's mundane wit, the setting is perfect.

Here is Mr. Russell's version of the story, "Collections and Recollections," p. 186:

A friend of mine in the diplomatic service, visiting Rome in the days of the Temporal Power, had the honour of an interview with Pio Nono. The Pope graciously offered him a cigar, "I am told that you will find them very fine." The Englishman made that stupidest of all answers, "Thanks, your Holiness, but I have no vices." "This isn't a vice; if it was, you would have it."

In comparison with Bywater's rendering, the diplomatist's telling of the story is as clumsy as the imaginary Englishman was stupid; it quite lacks the Italian finesse, and lacks the air of authenticity.

B. L. GILDERSLEEVE.

EDWIN WHITFIELD FAY

1865-1920

It is the sad duty of the Journal to record the recent death of one of its most frequent and valued contributors, EDWIN WHITFIELD FAY, Professor of Latin in the University of Texas. Called to the bedside of his sister in Pittsburgh, who was ill with pneumonia, he himself fell a victim to that disease, which carried him off on February 17. As a man, EDWIN WHITFIELD FAY was an honor to the community that was fortunate enough to possess him; as a teacher, he held a firm place in the esteem and affection of those who were privileged to be his pupils; as a scholar, he stood in the front rank of American men of learning, and achieved international distinction.

C. W. E. MILLER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Amos (Flora Ross). *Early Theories of Translation*. Columbia University Studies in English and Comparative Literature. 8°. xv + 184 pp. New York, *Columbia University Press* (Lemcke & Buechner, Agents), 1920. \$2.

'Amr Son of Qami'ah, *The Poems of*. Edited and translated by Sir Charles Lyall. 8 + 76 pp. 4°. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1919.

Balkan Review. Vol. II, Nos. 5 and 6, 1919 and 1920. London, Published by the *Rolls House Publishing Co., Ltd.*

Berghoeffer (C. W.). *Der Sammelkatalog wissenschaftlicher Bibliotheken des deutschen Sprachgebiets bei der Freiherrlich Carl von Rothschild'schen Oeffentlichen Bibliothek*. Frankfurt/Main, *Joseph Baer & Co.*, 1919. 61 pp. 4°.

Blake (Frank R.) *A Bibliography of the Philippine Languages*. Part I. (Reprinted from the *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 40, Part I, 1920, pp. 25-70.)

Bolling (George Melville). *Abstract Nouns in Homer*. Reprinted from *Classical Philology*, Vol. XIV, No. 4, October 1919.

Bulletin of The School of Oriental Studies, London Institution. Vol. I, Part III. London, *The School of Oriental Studies, London Institution*, 1920. Price six shillings.

Corpus scriptorum latinorum Paravianum. Moderante Carolo Pascal. *In aedibus Io. Bapt. Paraviae et sociorum*, Aug. Taurinorum, Romae, Mediolani, Florentiae, Neapoli, Panormi; Genuae, *apud Montaldum bibliopolam*.

1. Q. Valerii Catulli Carmina. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit Carolus Pascal.

2. Cornelii Taciti de origine et situ Germanorum liber. Ad fidem praecipue codicis Aesini recensuit, praefatus est Caesar Annibaldi. Appendicem criticam in Taciti libellum, scriptorum Romanorum de Germanis veteribus testimonia selecta adiecit Carolus Pascal.

3. C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de bello civili. Recensuit, praefatus est, brevi appendice critica instruxit Dominicus Bassi.

4. M. Tullii Ciceronis de re publica librorum sex quae supersunt. Recensuit, brevi appendice critica instruxit Carolus Pascal. Praefatus est, testimonia adiecit Iohannes Galbiati.

5. M. Minucii Felicis Octavius. Recognovit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit Aloisius Valmaggi.

6. T. Macci Plauti Stichus. Ad codicis Ambrosiani praecipue fidem edidit, appendicem criticam addidit C. O. Zuretti.

7. Cornelii Taciti de vita Iulii Agricolae liber. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit Caesar Annibaldi. Accedunt de Cornelio Tacito testimonia vetera a Carolo Pascal collecta.

8. M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro Milone, Pro Archia. Additis argumentis Asconi et scholiastae Gronoviani ad Milonianam, scholiastae Bobiensis ad utramque. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica et indicibus instruxit Sixtus Colombo.

9. P. Vergilii Maronis Bucolicon liber. Accedunt carmina Moretum Copa falso Vergilio adtributa. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit Carolus Pascal.

10. Cornelii Taciti Dialogus de oratoribus. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica et indicibus instruxit Fridericus Carolus Wick.

11. P. Ovidii Nasonis Tristia. Recensuit, praefatus est, brevi appendice critica instruxit Carolus Landi.

12. L. Annaei Senecae Thyestes, Phaedra. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit Humbertus Moricca.

13. Phaedri Fabulae. Ad fidem codicis Neapolitani denuo excussi edidit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit Dominicus Bassi.

14. T. Macci Plauti Captivi. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam et testimonia adiecit Carolus Pascal.

15. P. Vergilii Maronis Catalepton (Priapea et epigrammata), Maecenas, Priapeum "quid hoc novi est." Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam et indicem verborum addidit Rem. Sabbadini.

16. P. Ovidi Nasonis Artis amatoriae libri tres. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit C. Marchesi.

17. Carmina ludicra Romanorum (Pervigilium Veneris, carmen de rosis, Priapeorum libellus. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam testimonia adiecit Carolus Pascal.

18. Corneli Taciti Historiarum libri. Ad fidem codicis Medicei recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit Maximus Lenchantin de Gubernatis. Libri I et II.

22. P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos libri I, II, III. 23. — IV, V, VI. Recensuit, praefatus est, appendicem criticam addidit Rem. Sabbadini.

Cratippi Hellenicorum Fragmenta Oxyrhynchia. Scholarum in usum edidit Justus Hermannus Lipsius. Bonn, A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag, 1916. 1.20 M. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 138.)

Dietrich (Rudolf). Lateinische Sprüche. 1. Heft. De temperantia. 3. Auflage. Preis 60 Pf. Dresden u. Leipzig, C. A. Kochs Verlagsbuchhandlung (H. Ehlers), 1920.

Dissertationes philologiae Vindobonenses. Volumen XI. Vindobonae et Lipsiae, F. Deuticke, MCMXIII.

Elliott (Robert Dale). Transition in the Attic Orators. Menasha, Wisconsin, George Banta Publishing Co., 1919.

English Dictionary (Oxford). Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray and others. Stratus-Styx: By Henry Bradley. Sweep-Szmikite: By C. T. Onions. Oxford, The Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1919.

Fay (Edwin W.) Important Defects in Indo-European Phonology. Austin, Published by the University of Texas. (University of Texas Bulletin, No. 1743: August 1, 1917).

Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache. Hsgb. von Paul Kretschmer und Wilhelm Kroll. X. Band, 3. Heft. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1919.

Harrison (Jane Ellen). Aspects, Aorists and the Classical Tripos. Cambridge, University Press, 1919. 36 pp. 2sh. 6d. net.

Inter-America. Español. Volumen III, Número 6. Marzo de 1920. New York, Doubleday, Page & Co.

Jones (H. S. V.) Spenser's Defense of Lord Grey. Urbana, Published by the University of Illinois under the auspices of the Graduate School, 1919. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. V, No. 3.) \$1.00.

Journal of Philology, Vol. XXXV, No. 69. London, Macmillan and Co., Ltd.; Cambridge, Bowes and Bowes, Deighton, Bell and Co., Ltd., 1919.

Journal of the American Oriental Society. Vol. 39, Part 5, December, 1919. New Haven, Conn., Yale University Press.

Kurrelmeyer (W.) A Contemporary Critique of Schillers Räuber. (Reprinted from The Journal of English and Germanic Philology, Vol. XVIII, No. 1, Jan. 1919.)

—Contributions to German Lexicography from Translations of Heinrich von Eppendorff. (Reprinted from the Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXXIV, 2.)

—German Lexicography. Pts. 1-2. (Reprinted from Modern Language Notes, Vol. XXXIV, Nos. 5 and 7, May, Nov. 1919.)

—The Sources of Wieland's *Don Sylvio*. (Reprinted from Modern Philology, Vol. XVI, No. 12, April 1919.)

Laurand (L.) Manuel des études grecques et latines. Fasc. VII. Métrique, sciences complémentaires. . . . Paris, Auguste Picard, 1919.

Linforth (Ivan M.) Solon the Athenian. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1919. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 6.)

McFayden (Donald). The History of the Title Imperator under the Roman Empire. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1920.

Merrill (William A.) Notes on the Silvae of Statius. Book IV. Berkeley, University of California Press, 1920. (University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. 5, No. 7.)

Ogle (M. B.) The Perilous Bridge and Human Automata. (= Modern Language Notes, Vol. XXXV, March, 1920, pp. 129-136.)

Perrett (Wilfrid). Some Questions of Phonetic Theory. Chapter V. The Perception of Sound. Cambridge, W. Heffer & Sons., Ltd., 1919. 2sh. net.

Personalist (The). A Quarterly Journal of Philosophy, Theology, and Literature. Edited by Ralph Tyler Flewelling. Vol. I, No. 1, April, 1920. Los Angeles, University of Southern California. Yearly subscription, \$2. Single copies, 50 cents.

Place (Perley Oakland). Beginning Latin. An Introduction, by way of English, to the Latin Language. New York [etc.], American Book Company, 1919.

Plavti (T. Macci) Menaechmi. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Clara M. Knight. Cambridge, at the University Press, 1919.

Polish Commission of work preparatory to the Conference of Peace. Gdańsk and East Prussia. Paris, May 1919.

Reply of the Hellenic delegation to the statements submitted to the Peace Conference by the Bulgarian delegation with regard to the policy of Bulgaria and its claims to Thrace. Trans. from the French by Carroll N. Brown. Published for the American Hellenic Society by Oxford University Press, American Branch, 1920.

Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Das Monumentum Ancyranum, hrg. von Ernst Diehl. 3. Aufl. Bonn, A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag, 1918. 1.60 M. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 29-30.)

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. XXIX, Núms. 1 y 2. Julio-Octubre de 1919.

Rolfe (John C.) *A Friend of Caesar's*. Reprinted from *University of Pennsylvania Public Lectures*.

Rostagni (Augusto). *Giuliano l'Apostata*. Saggio critico con le operette politiche e satiriche tradotte e commentate. (= *Il Pensiero Greco*—Vol. 12.) 8°. vii + 399 pp. Torino, *Fratelli Bocca*, 1920. L. 28.

Smithsonian Institution. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 68. *A Structural and Lexical Comparison of the Tunica, Chitimacha, and Atakapa Languages*. By John B. Swanton. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1919.

— 33d Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology, 1911-12. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1919.

— Bulletin 69. *Native Villages and Village Sites East of the Mississippi*. By David I. Bushnell, Jr. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1919.

Supplementum Lyricum. Neue Bruchstücke von Archilochus, Alcaeus, Sappho, Corinna, Pindar, Bacchylides. Ausgewählt und erklärt von Ernst Diehl. 3. Aufl. Bonn, *A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag*, 1917. 2.40 M. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 33-34.)

Thucydides book IV, chapters I-XLI. (Pylus and Sphaacteria). Edited by J. H. E. Cress, and J. C. Wordsworth. Cambridge, at the *University Press*, 1919.

Vitae Homeri et Hesiodi. Edidit Vdalicus de Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. Bonn, *A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag*, 1916. 1.60 M. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 137.)

Vrijlandt (P.) *De apologia Xenophontea cum Platonica comparata*. Specimen litterarium inaugurale. Lugduni Batavorum, *A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgevers-maatschappij*, 1919.

Vürtheim (J.) *Stesichoros' Fragmente und Biographie*. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff's Uitgeversmij.*, 1919.

Vulgärlateinisches Uebungsbuch, hrsg. von Friedrich Slotty. Bonn, *A. Marcus und E. Weber's Verlag*, 1918. 2.50 M. (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen, 143.)

Wedel (Theodore Otto). *The Mediaeval Attitude toward Astrology, particularly in England*. New Haven: *Yale University Press*; London: *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*, 1920. (Yale Studies in English, LX.)

Withington (Robert). *English Pageantry: An Historical Outline*. Vol. I. xx + 258 pp. 4°. Cambridge, *Harvard University Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, 1918. \$3.50.

Yale Shakespeare (The). *The Life of Timon of Athens*. Edited by Stanley T. Williams. New Haven, *Yale University Press*, 1919; London, *Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press*.